DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 827 CE 022 445

AUTHOR	Guttmacher, Mary Johnson
TITLE	Individual and Familial Correlates of Career Salience among Upwardly Mobile College Women. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Huron Inst., Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 79
NOTE	559p.
EDRS PRICE	MF02/PC23 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Career Choice; Career Planning; *College Students; *Family Attitudes; Family Characteristics; Family Influence; *Females; Individual Characteristics; Occupational Aspiration; Sex Role; *Vocational Interests; *Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Career Salience

ABSTRACT

A case study was conducted using a sample of 271 women selected from a state college by a stratified random cluster technique that approximates proportional representation of women in all four classes and all college majors. The data source was an extensive questionnaire designed to measure the attitudes and behavior of interest. The major dependent variable studied was career salience, defined as follows: the degree to which a woman views work as an important, relatively continuous, activity; considers work important for its intrinsic value and the opportunities it offers for self-expression/accomplishment; and considers career needs in making family decisions. The data analyses tested the power of the deviance and enrichment explanations of the sources of career salience. The findings concerning related individual attributes support the enrichment view, indicating that strongly career-salient women have atypical but internally consistent plans and attitudes based in variant views of the female role. Specifically, career salience is strongly, positively related to self-ratings of ability, educational aspirations/expectations, choosing an occupation that is atypical for women, egalitarian sex role attitudes, and the age one wants to marry and have children. Degree of career salience is strongly, negatively related to the importance of family role-related motivations for college attendance/job choice, desiring to be a teacher, the importance placed on marriage and having children, and the amount of influence and degree of closeness to parents, especially mothers. Career salience also seems to increase gradually during the college years. (Author/BM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: OE HE

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED174827

FINAL REPORT

Individual and Familial Correlates of Career Salience Among Upwardly Mobile College Women

National Institute of Education Project No. 4-0554

Mary Johnson Guttmacher

The Huron Institute, Inc.
Cambridge, Massachusetts

May 1979

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official National Institute of Education position or policy.

CE 022 445

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The original idea for this project grew out of my own experience. This study is an attempt to integrate my professional and personal concerns. As such, this report is dedicated to all the people who influenced my own educational and career aspirations and helped me to wrestle with career-family conflicts. My parents, Martha and Herman Johnson, encouraged me to go to college and to do my best at whatever I attempted. Kiyoshi Ikeda convinced me to become a sociologist and became my first mentor. Nancy St. John and Regina Yando provided helpful comments on earlier drafts of this report, but, most importantly, served as role models and sources of emotional support. David Cohen also was understanding and helpful through numerous crises.

My colleagues at State helped me to plan the study and administer the questionnaire, as well as sharing their observations about the concerns of our students. The women in my classes inspired this study. The women who participated in the study deserve my utmost gratitude for taking the time to complete the questionnaire, and for showing an interest in sharing a part of their lives with me.

The members of the department of Sociology, Case Western Reserve University, gave me a home and colleague support, when, like many women, I "stepped off" the traditional academic ladder. Diane McEwen and Karen Rubin served as able research assistants and supportive friends. Sue Green was an understanding and talented typist. Raymond Beardsley supplied valuable technical services. The National Institute of Education provided the financial support necessary for the completion of this study, while the Huron Institute, Inc. supplied grant administration services.

As is the case for many women, the completion of this report depended as much on other sources of support as on professional colleagues. Ellen Aronson, Linda Beardsley and the entire Beardsley family, Portia Lewis, Di McCall, and Linda Orrell were the crucial mother-surrogates who gave me the time and peace of mind to work. The emotional, financial, and intellectual contributions and sacrifices of Larry Guttmacher are inestimable. And most important there is Joshua, who sometimes reluctantly announced "Mommy workin'," but who understands that mommies can write books and love and care for their children.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES viii

ABSTRACT xii

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose, Importance, and Major Themes of the Study 1
Scope and Limitations of the Study 8
Organization of the Report 10
Conclusion 12

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 13

Introduction 13
The Place of a Career in the Female Role Constellation 14
Role Concepts 14
Conflicts Inherent in Normative Definitions of Female Roles 18
Implications of Female Role Norms for Understanding Women's Career Decisions 25
Measuring Career Salience in Women 30
Competing Explanations of Sources of Career Salience in Women 43
Correlates of Career Salience in Women 46
Age 46
Ability 49
Educational Attainment and Aspirations 50
Educational and Occupational Values 52
Career Choice and Work Experience 58
Sex Role Ideology 65
Family Plans and Attitudes towards Family Roles 67
Personality and Self-Concept 72
The Influence of Significant Others on Career Salience . . . 79
The Roles of a Significant Other 79
Family Background and Career Salience 81
The Influence of Teachers and Male Peers on Career Salience 114
Discussion and Statement of Hypotheses 119
Components of Career Salience 120
Correlates of Career Salience 123
The Influence of Significant Others on Career Salience . . 132
Conclusion 144

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY 146

Introduction to the Study Design 146
Subjects 149
  Characteristics of the Population 149
  Sampling Procedures 152
Instrument 164
  Development of the Questionnaire 164
  Structure of the Final Questionnaire 166
  Analysis of Questionnaire Response Patterns 167
Procedures 170
Conclusion 172

CHAPTER IV. THE MEASURE OF CAREER SALIENCE 174

Results 174
Discussion 190
Conclusion 196

CHAPTER V. THE RELATIONSHIP OF CAREER SALIENCE TO OTHER INDIVIDUAL ATTRIBUTES 198

Introduction 198
Results 198
  College Class 198
  Academic Achievement and Intellectual Interests 199
  Educational Aspirations 205
  Educational and Occupational Values 208
  Career Choice and Work Experience 216
  Sex Role Attitudes 225
  Family Plans and Attitudes towards Family Roles 241
  Self-Concept and Personality 248
Discussion of the Implications of the Findings 258
  College Class 258
  Academic Achievement and Intellectual Interests 262
  Educational Aspirations 264
  Educational and Occupational Values 266
  Career Choice and Work Experience 271
  Sex Role Attitudes 277
  Family Plans and Attitudes towards Family Roles 280
  Self-Concept and Personality 285
Conclusion 287

CHAPTER VI. THE INFLUENCE OF SIGNIFICANT OTHERS ON CAREER SALIENCE . . . 290

- Introduction . . . 290
- Results . . . 290
  - Closeness to Parents . . . 290
  - Parents' Educational Attainment and Occupational Status . . . 298
  - Mother's Work Patterns . . . 308
  - Dimensions of Differential Socialization . . . 316
  - Other Aspects of Family Structure and Background . . . 341
  - Teachers and Other Role Models . . . 351
  - Male Peers . . . 356
- Discussion of the Implications of the Findings . . . 363
  - Closeness to Parents . . . 363
  - Parents' Educational Attainment and Occupational Status . . . 365
  - Mother's Work Patterns . . . 367
  - Dimensions of Differential Socialization . . . 370
  - Other Aspects of Family Structure and Background . . . 378
  - Teachers and Other Role Models . . . 380
  - Male Peers . . . 382
- Conclusion . . . 384

CHAPTER VII. CONCLUSION . . . 386

- Introduction . . . 386
- Summary of the Study Findings . . . 386
- A Re-evaluation of the Deviance and Enrichment Hypotheses . . . 398
- Implications of the Study Findings for Educational Policy . . . 401
- Suggestions for Further Research . . . 403
- Career Salience as a Potential Consequence of Social Mobility . . . 405

APPENDIX 1. QUESTIONNAIRE . . . 407

APPENDIX 2. SPECIFICATION OF CODING PROCEDURES AND CODING RELIABILITY DATA . . . 433

- General Procedures . . . 433
- Sex Stereotypes of Fields of Study and Occupations . . . 434
- Occupational Status . . . 435
- Opinion of the Women's Liberation Movement . . . 438
- Self-Concept and Conceptions of Others . . . 439

APPENDIX 3. PROCEDURES USED IN INDEX CONSTRUCTION AND ESTIMATES OF INDEX RELIABILITY 448

- General Procedures 448
- Academic Achievement Index 452
- Educational and Occupational Values Indexes 453
  - Educational Values 453
  - Occupational Values 455
  - General Value-Orientations 456
  - Reasons for Choosing this College 457
- Sex Role Ideology Indexes 459
- Changes in College Index 463
- Socioeconomic Status Index 465
- Mother's Work History Index 466
- Parental Roles Indexes 466
- Parents' Educational Values Indexes 473
- Homogeneity of Social Experience Indexes 477

APPENDIX 4. ESTIMATES OF THE RELIABILITY OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT DATA 479

BIBLIOGRAPHY 484

LIST OF TABLES

1. Comparison of the Sample and Population Distributions by Graduating Class and Academic Major 158
2. Representation of Education Students Among Upperclass Women in the Sample Compared to Best Estimates of their Representation Among Upperclass Women in the Population . 161
3. Distribution of Responses on Items in the Career Salience Index 187
4. Career Salience Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 189
5. Career Salience Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings 190
6. Relationship between Career Salience and College Class . . 200
7. Relationship between Career Salience and Academic Achievement 202
8. Distribution of Responses on the Educational Plans Measures 206
9. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Value-Orientation Measures 214
10. Distribution of Responses Concerning the Nature of Previous Work Experience 224
11. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Sex Role Attitude Measures 231
12. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Family Plans Measures 243
13. Distribution of Responses by Evaluative Tone and Sex Stereotype on the "Who Am I?" Measures of the Self-Concept 252
14. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for Selected Dimensions of the Self-Concept . . 253
15. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Personality Inventory Items 256
16. Distribution of Responses on Items in the Closeness to Mother and Closeness to Father Indexes 291
17. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for Selected Measures of Closeness to Parents . 294
18. Distribution of Responses on My Parents Think I Am and the Parent I Want to Be Like 297
19. Distribution of Responses on the Parental Socioeconomic Status Measures 303
20. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Mother's Work Experience Measures . . . 311

21. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Parents' Marital Roles Measures 319
22. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Measures of Parents' Current Emphasis on Achievement and Independence 323
23. Distribution of Responses Concerning Parents' Educational Aspirations for their Daughter 325
24. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Parents' Educational Values Measures . . 328
25. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Measures of the Degree of Influence of Parents on their Daughter's Educational Decisions 331
26. Distribution of Responses Concerning Differences in Parents' Socialization Emphases for Daughters and Sons 334
27. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Parents' Sex Role Attitudes Measures . . 337
28. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Measures of Other Aspects of Family Structure 344
29. Additional Characteristics of the Respondents' Backgrounds . 347
30. Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Homogeneity of Past Experience Measures 350
31. Distribution of Responses on My Teacher Thinks I Am, My Boy Friend Thinks I Am, the Woman I Admire, and the Man I Admire 354
32. Summary of the Findings Concerning the Relationship of Career Salience to Other Individual Attributes 388
33. Summary of the Findings Concerning the Influence of Significant Others on Career Salience 392
34. Relationships between Scores on the Evaluative Tone and Sex Stereotype Dimensions of the Current Self-Concept and Responses to the Personality Inventory Items 446
35. Academic Achievement Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 452
36. Academic Achievement Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings 452
37. Self-Development Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 453
38. Family-Betterment Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 453
39. Educational Values: Factor Structure 454
40. Educational Values: Factor Correlations 454
41. Extrinsic-Rewards Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 455
42. Family-Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 455
43. Occupational Values: Factor Structure 455

44. General Extrinsic-Rewards Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 456
45. General Family Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 456
46. General Value-Orientations: Factor Structure 457
47. College Choice Quality Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 457
48. College Choice Parochialism Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 458
49. Reasons for Choosing This College: Factor Structure . . . 458
50. Marital Role Ideology Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 459
51. Marital Role Ideology Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings 460
52. Feminist Attitudes Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 461
53. Feminist Attitudes Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings 462
54. Change in Intellectual Aspirations Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 463
55. Changes in College: Factor Structure 464
56. Changes in College: Factor Correlations 464
57. Family Socioeconomic Status Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 465
58. Family Socioeconomic Status Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings 465
59. Mother's Work History Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 466
60. Maternal Dominance Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 466
61. Maternal Roles: Factor Structure 467
62. Maternal Roles: Factor Correlations 467
63. Paternal Dominance Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 468
64. Paternal Roles: Factor Structure 468
65. Paternal Roles: Factor Correlations 469
66. Closeness to Mother Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 469
67. Closeness to Mother Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings 470
68. Closeness to Father Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 470
69. Closeness to Father Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings 471
70. Father's Advice Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 471
71. Father's Advice Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings 472
72. Father's Involvement in Housekeeping: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 472

73. Mother's Self-Development Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 473
74. Mother's Family-Betterment Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 473
75. Mother's Educational Values: Factor Structure 474
76. Mother's Educational Values: Factor Correlations 474
77. Father's Self-Development Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 475
78. Father's Family-Betterment Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 475
79. Father's Educational Values: Factor Structure 476
80. Father's Educational Values: Factor Correlations 476
81. Religious Homogeneity Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 477
82. Ethnic Homogeneity Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 477
83. Financial Homogeneity Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations 477
84. Homogeneity of Social Experience Indexes: Factor Structure 478
85. Homogeneity of Social Experiences Indexes: Factor Correlations 478
86. Comparison of the Sample to the Population on Selected Achievement Measures 481

ABSTRACT

Improvements in access to higher education have opened college doors to more women from working-class backgrounds. We know little about the career aspirations of these new students. This project, a cross-sectional case study of 271 women attending a state college, begins to fill this gap.

The sample was chosen by a stratified random cluster technique that approximates proportional representation of women in all four classes and all college majors. The instrument is an extensive questionnaire.

The major dependent variable is career salience, defined as the degree to which a woman views work as an important, relatively continuous, activity; considers work important for its intrinsic value, and the opportunities it offers for self-expression and accomplishment; and considers career needs in making family decisions. The analyses test the power of the deviance and enrichment explanations of the sources of career salience.

The findings concerning related individual attributes support the enrichment view, indicating that strongly career-salient women have atypical, but internally consistent, plans and attitudes, that are based in variant views of the female role. Specifically, career salience is strongly, positively related to self-ratings of ability,

educational aspirations and expectations, recent changes in occupational choice, choosing an occupation that is atypical for women, egalitarian sex role attitudes, evaluation of and amount of exposure to the women's movement, and the age one wants to marry and have children. Degree of career salience is strongly, negatively related to the importance of family role-related motivations for college attendance and job choice, desiring to be a teacher, the importance placed on marriage, and the degree of disappointment expected if one could not have children.

There is some support for the enrichment explanation's suggestion that career salience is a product of differential socialization in the family. Career salience is positively related to parents' ideological support for women working outside the home; and to mother's, father's, and daughter's positive attitudes towards the mother's actual employment. Career salience is negatively related to the importance parents place on the enhancement of family role performance as a reason for their daughter's college attendance.

However, the most significant finding is that career salience is negatively related to the amount of influence of, and degree of closeness to, parents, especially mothers. The deviance hypothesis suggests that career salience in women is an attempt to compensate for conflictful family experiences. Among women who are potentially upwardly mobile, disassociation from parents may be necessary in order to realize the ambitions that parents originally inspired. Lower status parents are not adequate models and can not provide the instrumental support necessary for the implementation of career aspirations.

To some extent, teachers and male peers fill this gap in the support structure. Strongly career-salient women are more likely than other women to choose a teacher as the person they most admire. While highly career-salient women date less than other women, they are more likely to report that their special male friends support their high educational aspirations and want their wives to have a career.

Career salience increases gradually during the college years, with the most significant increase occurring during the junior year. Strongly career-salient women are more likely than other women to believe that their educational and career aspirations have been heightened since entering college. The data suggest that educational intervention as late as the college years can increase, or provide support for, the career interests of nonelite women. An effective career education program must encourage women to plan a life style, not just a career.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose, Importance, and Major Themes of the Study

The 1960's saw a growing demand for universal higher education, bringing to colleges' doors young men and women of backgrounds, lifestyles, and aspirations profoundly different from those of the traditional collegian. Although we are still far from providing equal access to higher education, the growth of public colleges, and the more widely shared belief that a college education is the key to social mobility, have resulted in the college attendance of more youths from working-class backgrounds. Among this group of first-generation college students, particularly in the state institutions that originally emphasized teacher preparation, are a large number of working-class women.

We know little about the aspirations, concerns, or needs of this new group of students. It is only recently that academicians have gone beyond fitting these students into traditional programs geared to students from middle-class backgrounds to ask: Who are they? What do they want? These questions have more often been asked of the representatives of racial and ethnic minority groups than of the group that accounts for most of the increase in college enrollments: the sons and daughters of white blue-collar workingmen (see, for example, Cross, 1971).

One of the reasons we know little about the motivations for the college attendance of this group is that what we do know about them suggests that they should not be in college at all. This particularly is true of the working-class woman. Most of the literature on the educational and career aspirations of women and working-class youth suggests that the working-class woman's sex role and class position should work together to lower her aspirations and practical possibilities for higher education and a career. I would suggest that these two status attributes no longer work completely in tandem, that the greater acceptance of the necessity of higher education by working-class parents has introduced their daughters to new role conflicts.

Much of what we know about the role conflicts, specifically the career-marriage conflicts, of educated women is based on studies of elite populations. Thus, we have case studies of women attending Barnard (Komarovsky, 1946, 1950, 1953), Carnegie-Mellon (Angrist and Almquist, 1975), Stanford (Wallin, 1950), Vassar (M. Freedman, 1967; Sanford, 1956), and Wellesley (Counselman, 1971). We know of the career attainment, or lack thereof, of alumnae of Carnegie-Mellon (Angrist, 1966), Columbia (Ginzberg and Yohalem, 1966), Jackson College (Eyde, 1962, 1968), and Radcliffe (R. Baruch, 1966, 1967). Three studies of alumnae (Birnbaum, 1971; Gysbers et al., 1968; Wolfson, 1972) focus on more broadly based state university populations, though the Birnbaum study considers only those women who were among the academic elite as undergraduates. Recently, some researchers have begun to turn their attention to studying the career interests of undergraduate women attending individual public institutions, though most of these studies focus on women at major state universities and/or concentrate only on personality correlates of career plans (Cowan and Moore, 1971; Erickson and Nordin, 1974; Hanson, 1974; Richardson, 1972, 1974, 1975; Sedney and B. Turner, 1975; Tangri, 1972; B. Turner, 1972; Witkin, 1973). Only the nationwide surveys of college students (for example, Astin and Bisconti, 1973; The Carnegie Commission, 1973; Cross, 1968, 1971; J. Davis, 1964, 1965; Karman, 1973; Trent and Medsker, 1968) or alumnae (Fogarty et al., 1971; Sharp, 1970; Shea et al., 1971; U.S. Department of Labor, 1966) give us a glimpse of the aspirations, concerns, and probable future career involvement of the more typical college woman.

As "nonelite" students in "nonelite" institutions become the majority of the college population, we need to increase our understanding of the role conflicts they face and their motivations for college attendance, in order to be able to educate and advise them. The lack of detailed case study information about women attending regional state colleges and community colleges,[1] where working-class women are most likely to be found in significant numbers (see Cross, 1971; J. Davis, 1965; Dunham, 1969), partially is an artifact of the employment patterns of researchers. However, there also seems to be an implicit assumption that there is no need to study the importance of a career to these women; presumedly, they are not career-oriented. However, one also could suggest that the social mobility orientations of the new women students may make them more receptive than their more advantaged sisters to education for a career.

---

[1] One team of researchers (K. Moore, 1975; Veres, 1974; Veres and K. Moore, 1975) has studied the career-orientations of two-year college women attending the public community colleges in New York State.

One of the major purposes of the study described here is to fill this gap in our understanding of the importance of a career to college-educated women. The research conducted is a detailed case study of the career and family aspirations of women attending a state college, most of whom are from working-class backgrounds. As used here, the term working-class describes families in which the father is a relatively stably employed semi-skilled or skilled blue-collar or lower white-collar worker with a high school education or less, and in which the mother shares these characteristics or has slightly higher status attributes.[2]

---

[2] Anyone using the term "working class" today is begging for confusion in an era when this term is used to describe many different social strata. The 1950's saw the disappearance of the working class altogether (Mayer, 1955; Seligman, 1959; U.S. Department of Labor, 1959), but the term was resurrected in the 1960's to apply to just about everyone. Thus, we have distinctions between the "old" working class and the "new" working class, with the former term being applied to all blue-collar workers or only to stable blue-collar workers (S. M. Miller and Riesman, 1961b), while the latter may cover the range from the very poor ethnic minorities (S. M. Miller, 1964b) to university-trained professionals and white-collar workers (Oppenheimer, 1970).

The confusion seems to stem from the seeming incongruity between the common sociological distinction of blue-collar -- white-collar, and the growing awareness of the existence of the very poor, on the one hand, and the affluence of skilled blue-collar workers, on the other. In terms of income, there seems to be a melting in the middle, crosscutting the blue-collar -- white-collar line, with the very poor and the very rich providing the only clearcut bases of social class comparison (Mayer, 1963).

The important questions are whether high income can overcome other status deficits and whether equality of income necessarily entails homogeneity of life style. Concerning the first question, Coleman and Neugarten (1971; Coleman, 1973) believe that income can overcome status deficits associated with one's occupational title. However, they also suggest that we are moving into a period when education will take on more importance in determining social status. Coleman (1973) notes that, because of education inflation, one now needs at least some college or post-high school education to claim lower-middle-class status. It may be that education will replace income as a means

The second major contribution of this study is its focus on understanding the components and correlates of career salience, the degree of importance women attach to work relative to the emphasis they place on other sources of personal satisfaction. I argue that researchers have erroneously focussed on attempting to explain how women choose a particular career, based on their understanding of the important choice points in the vocational decision-making process of men. Unlike men, women's primary choice is whether to work at all. At the present time, I believe that the important task is to elucidate how one might encourage women to consider having a career as a life-enhancing option.

---

of maintaining a ceiling on the status attainable by the high school-educated skilled worker.

Concerning life style differences, Komarovsky (1970) queries: "Can we assume that a spread in patterns of 'having' has been accompanied by a spread of ways of thinking, in values and attitudes?" One certainly would expect that changes in the opportunity structure may have led to life style adaptations within the "old" working class. However, most researchers studying blue-collar workers in the last 15 years suggest that, although workers appear to be more similar to the middle-class than in the past, the meaning of their adaptations is still different; there have been no changes in the basic themes of working-class life (for example, see Coleman, 1973; Handel and Rainwater, 1964; S. M. Miller and Riesman, 1961b). Values and attitudes, particularly in relation to family structure, are most impervious to change (Komarovsky, 1967, 1970; Marciano, 1974; Rubin, 1976). Some researchers even have suggested that the lack of change in working-class life style indicates that this group really is not part of a social class continuum, that it forms a subcommunity insulated from the influence of changes in currents of thought in the rest of society (Hamilton, 1964; Komarovsky, 1970).

There seems to be enough evidence to suggest that one may expect continued differences between the "old" working class and the middle class in our society in terms of the attitudes and values of interest in this study, educational and career aspirations and sex role expectations. However, it is probably unwise to consider these social class groups as absolute and isolated from each other's influence.

Once having a career is more widely accepted, the stage will be set to encourage women to enter a broader range of career fields.

Because of the centrality of family obligations to the definition of the normative female role, women plan a life style, not just a career. The decision to assign high priority to work affects the definition and importance of other adult roles. An adequate measure of career salience must consider family role conceptions as well as career role conceptions, and must elucidate the importance of work relative to the importance of other adult roles, if it is to have any utility in predicting the future career involvement of young women. I have developed such a measure for use in this study.

In the process of developing a measure and definition of career salience relevant to the life style planning of women, I reviewed the growing literature on the career decision-making process among women. A subsidiary contribution of this report is that I have pulled together, for what I believe is the first time, the information collected over the last 20 years about correlates and antecedents of career salience in women. Since most researchers have focussed on occupational choice, measures of career salience often are simplistic and information about the corollaries of the importance attached to a career are presented as serendipitous, rather than central, findings. The review of the literature reported here should be of use to other researchers who wish to study this important variable.

Finally, this study considers the influence of parents in more detail than have other studies of the origins of career salience in women. Most of the information available about the correlates of career salience concerns other contemporaneous attributes of the women studied. We know little about the kinds of socialization experiences in the family that might explain why some women attach more importance to a career than do others. This study considers to what extent theories about other individual attributes that describe women who are more or less career-salient apply to the special type of population studied, women from working-class backgrounds who attend a state college. Because these women come from different family backgrounds than those of women studied by other researchers, familial correlates that might be important predictors of variation in degree of career salience in a sample that, as a whole, is not expected to attach much importance to a career, are considered in detail.

The specific hypotheses concerning the individual and familial correlates of career salience tested in this study were developed on the basis of the review of the literature and, thus, are stated at the conclusion of that review in Chapter II. In my critique of the literature and summaries of the findings of this study, I relate the data to two competing explanations of sources of career salience in women. A central issue in the literature is whether women who attach importance to a career are maladjusted or just different. Briefly, the maladjustment explanation suggests that, for women, strong career salience is a "negative" choice, growing out of an inability to meet female behavioral and personality norms, a lack of success in heterosexual relations, or strained family relationships. Those who see women who attach great importance to a career as different rather than deviant claim that such women have made a positive choice based on variant conceptions of the female role that are products of a broader range of experiences and access to a variety of role models.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The research project conducted to explore these issues is a cross-sectional case study of the career aspirations of 271 women between the ages of 17 and 26 attending a four-year state college. The sample was chosen by a stratified random cluster technique that approximates proportional representation of women in all four classes and all college majors. The instrument is an extensive questionnaire that uses a combination of closed- and open-ended questions to elicit information about the areas of interest. The data analyses attempt to meet two objectives: to describe the attitudes towards family and career and the family background of a little studied type of college population, and to consider the relationships between career salience, other individual attributes, and family background characteristics for this type of population.

The strengths of the study also define its limitations. As noted above, the lack of detailed, case study information about nonelite students attending nonelite colleges served as the impetus for the design and execution of this study. However, because it is a case study of one college population, in which women from family backgrounds representing a narrow "slice of social class" predominate, the results can not be generalized to all college women. The use of a questionnaire allowed me to obtain a wealth of information from a relatively large sample, but the complexity of the factors involved in individual women's decisions about work suggests that there is still a need for studies based on in-depth interviews with similar types of samples. One can not make definite predictions about actual career involvement based on cross-sectional data, but, hopefully, this only is the first stage of a longitudinal study that will follow these women into adulthood to determine the predictive utility of measured career salience during college and elucidate the intervening contingencies that affect the extent to which women carry out their aspirations. The data analyses reported here stress correlation rather than prediction. The size of the data base made it impossible to consider all the potential interrelationships among variables in this report. The findings paint a broad picture of the nature and sources of career salience among one group of college-educated women from working-class backgrounds on which further analysis and additional studies of such women may be based.

Finally, the data for this study were collected in 1973, and there have been important changes in women's career opportunities and work participation since that time. However, as will be explored in more detail throughout this report, these women, and the population they represent, are remarkable for the extent to which they were insulated from the ferment caused by the women's movement at the height of its activity in the early 1970's. If this study was replicated today, a higher proportion of a group of similar women might express strong career interests, partially as a result of the fact that some of the demands posed by the women's movement have been accepted in the wider society. However, I expect that there has been little change in basic female role conceptions, and, especially, in the nature of sex role messages from parents.

Organization of the Report

The body of the report that follows is divided into six chapters. Chapter II reviews the available literature on the meaning and correlates of career salience in women. The nature of social roles and the normative definitions of female roles are considered to explain why placing emphasis on a career is problematic for women. Available definitions and measures of career salience are critiqued and a new definition is proposed. Other research findings concerning the individual attributes that are correlated with degree of career salience are summarized. The potential effects of significant others, especially parents, on women's degree of interest in a career are outlined on the basis of theories of the roles of significant others and the nature of the development of sex role identity, and the available information about the effects of parents, teachers, and male peers on career salience is summarized. Finally, hypotheses to be tested in this study, based on the analysis of the literature, are stated, and the deviance and enrichment hypotheses are reviewed in light of these hypotheses.

Chapter III describes the study conducted to test these hypotheses. Design, sampling, instrumentation, and measurement issues are considered in detail. The study population is described and the representativeness of the sample is estimated.

Chapter IV describes the development and testing of the measure of career salience. The components of the final index allow for further refinement of a definition of career salience relevant to the life plans of nonelite college-educated women.

Chapter V reports the findings concerning the relationships between career salience and other contemporaneous attributes of the subjects. The attributes considered include a wide range of attitudes towards education, work, family, and self, as outlined in the table of contents. This chapter closes with a discussion of the theoretical and policy implications of the findings.

Chapter VI considers the effects of significant others on career salience. The effects of parents are emphasized, with consideration of the differentiating effects of closeness to parents, family socioeconomic status, mother's work patterns, parental marital role division, and parents' emphasis on achievement, educational aspirations and values, and sex role attitudes. The effects of additional aspects of family structure and the influence of the attitudes of teachers and male peers are considered briefly. The deviance and enrichment hypotheses are reconsidered in light of the findings, and implications for educational policy, based on evidence of gaps in the support structures available to working-class women, are suggested.

Chapter VII summarizes the study findings and presents two case studies that further illuminate the profiles of women who vary in degree of career salience. The implications of the findings for evaluating the deviance and enrichment hypotheses are recapitulated, the policy implications are summarized, and suggestions for further research are made. Finally, career salience in working-class women who attend college is evaluated as a potential consequence of social mobility.

The body of the report is supplemented by four appendices and an extensive bibliography. Appendix 1 contains the questionnaire used in this study. Appendixes 2 through 4 provide the documentation necessary to assess the reliability of coding methods, composite indexes, and self-reported academic achievement data, respectively.

Conclusion

This project is a study of an important, but overlooked group of college-age women, women from working-class backgrounds attending a nonelite state college. The analysis focuses on measuring career salience, the relative degree of importance attached to a career as a source of life satisfaction, and draws a profile of other individual attributes and family background factors that describe women with varying degrees of interest in a future career. The resulting picture provides clues as to whether women who value career involvement turn to a career because of unhappiness and lack of success in the "feminine", expressive domain, or as a positive outlet for meeting their needs for achievement and a sense of accomplishment.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The revi[illegible] the literature that follows provides the groundwork for the development of the definition and measure of career salience used in this case study of a group of college women. It also suggests hypothetical relationships between career salience, other individual attributes, and family background based on relevant concepts from role and reference group theory. I critique the available measures of career salience and use research findings to clarify the distinction between components and correlates of this construct. I then consider the available evidence concerning the effects of significant others, particularly parents, on career salience. Finally, in a discussion of trends in the findings of other studies, I evaluate the explanatory power of two major theories of sources of career salience in women.

The literature on women's behavior and attitudes is growing constantly. In order to provide some limits for this review, I have focussed on those study findings that have implications for the direct relationships between career salience and individual attributes or family background. Although I have reviewed studies that suggest possible sources of indirect effects, I have not attempted to include all such studies here.

The Place of a Career in the Female Role Constellation

Role Concepts

Angrist (1969) has pointed out that nowhere has the use of the term "role" been more muddled than in the study of sex roles. I would like to avoid this problem by defining the terms I will use and considering the meaning of various role and role conflict dimensions, based on several major reviews of role theory (Biddle and Thomas, 1966; Gross, Mason, and McEachern, 1958; Sarbin and Allen, 1968; Yinger, 1965).

The label "woman" refers to a position or status. A position can be defined as a ". . . location . . . in a system of social relationships" (Gross et al., 1958, p. 67). A position is a unit of social structure, while a role is a unit of culture, referring to the normatively approved patterns of behavior for the occupants of a given position, or ". . . the more or less agreed-upon blueprint for action" (Yinger, 1965, p. 107). Along with the structural and cultural terms, one must delineate a personality term to signify an individual's personal adaptation of a role. I prefer to use the term role-conception to refer to this aspect of self-definition, while others have suggested the use of the terms internalized role (Yinger, 1965) or personal role-definition (Levinson, 1959).

It is important to distinguish between the ideational component of roles, represented by the role expectations others have for one's performance and one's personal role conception, and the behavioral dimensions of roles, represented by actual role performance. One can not assume that measurement of the ideational component will lead to correct prediction of role performance, since situational variables affect actual behavior. In the present analysis, it will be impossible to measure role performance in marriage and career roles since few of these college women currently are enacting these roles. This study primarily is an analysis of role conceptions. Role performance in relevant contemporary roles, such as dating behavior and academic performance, may suggest how individual women will enact their marriage and career role conceptions.

Two further general role dimensions are especially relevant in the consideration of sex roles. Some roles are more dominant than others (Bates, 1956). I would suggest that, in our society, sex roles are still dominant roles. That is, the role expectations that go along with being a woman affect attitudes and behavior far beyond the biological sex differences. Career role performance is judged not only in terms of its appropriateness in the occupational role, but also in terms of the norms for the female role. Second, roles differ in the specificity or diffuseness of the normative demands associated with them (Sarbin and Allen, 1968). Sex role demands, especially those for women, are relatively vaguely defined. This lack of specific role expectations and clear role boundaries can lead to confusion on the part of those who occupy the status "woman" (Angrist, 1969, 1971-1972; A. Rose 1951; Sarbin, 1954).

Vague role definition is one potential source of sex role conflict. Role conflict may be perceived or unrecognized, internal or external, intrarole or interrole, legitimate or illegitimate (Yinger, 1965).

Internal role conflict occurs when an individual has internalized a role that includes contradictory expectations or when she occupies two or more positions that involve incompatible role expectations, while external role conflict refers to incompatible expectations from significant others in the position network. This distinction underlines the importance of delineating the source of conflicting role definitions, whether the incongruity is part of the individual's role conceptions, role expectations from others, or both. In the case of college women, who can be seen as in the process of defining their identity, one can expect that potentially conflicting conceptions of marriage and career roles will have been internalized, with the sorting process, or strain toward consistency, being one of the problematic tasks of the life stage. External role conflicts will be especially acute in the clash between the role expectations of the primary socialization agency, the family, and the secondary socialization agency, the college community. There will also be conflicting expectations among the normative demands from one reference group, with lack of clarity in the definition of the preferred dominance of expressive (marriage) and instrumental (career) components of roles being one of the most acute sources of conflict for these women.

The distinction between intrarole and interrole conflict refers to the number of roles involved rather than to the source of conflict. Thus, "an individual is confronted with an intrarole conflict if he perceives that others hold different expectations for him as the incumbent of a single position . . . . In interrole conflict, an individual perceives that others hold different expectations for him as the incumbent of two or more positions" (Gross et al., 1958, pp. 248-249). Although the source of conflicts between marriage and career roles is the problematic definition of their relative dominance in the single sex role, generally, the two role constellations of wife-mother and career woman will be considered as separate roles. Thus, intrarole conflicts will occur because of differential definitions of the components of adequate marriage role performance or adequate career role performance. Interrole conflicts will result from incompatibility between marriage and career role conceptions.

Gross, Mason and McEachern (1958) emphasize the importance of a final dimension of role conflict, whether differential expectations are considered to be legitimate or illegitimate. Whether an expectation is considered as legitimate depends on the dominant definition of the role in the culture and the definition accepted by the most important significant others in the position network. I would suggest that women will accept the expectations of parents, as representative of their primary social class reference group, as more legitimate than the new inputs from college professors and peers. A major exception to this general pattern will be the effects of the role expectations of male friends. With marriage aspirations dominant in college women's minds, the expectations of potential spouses may take on great legitimacy.

Conflicts Inherent in Normative Definitions of Female Roles

Parsons and Bales (1955) suggest that the major distinction between what they view as complementary male and female roles is the difference between the instrumental roles of the male and the expressive roles of the female. They feel that this balance is necessary, and that some individuals must be assigned one or the other of these types of roles in order to insure the maintenance of society. The "expressive", female role includes four components: domestic, career/job, glamour girl, and humanistic or culture-bearer roles. Kluckhohn (1953) suggests the addition of a status symbol role as another central dimension of the female role.

Although a work role is included in this classic definition of the female role, Parsons and Bales (1955) note that like her other roles, when a woman engages in work, her goal is expressive; she works to support and care for her family. For a man, his occupation also is a component of his family role, but he is the family's status-giver, while his wife simply reflects the husband's status (also see Turner, 1964b).

More important, the work role is an optional or contingent role for women, while it is central to the definition of the male role. Rossi (1972) suggests that roles vary in the extent to which it is culturally and psychologically permissable to express ambivalence or admit negative feelings towards them. Ambivalence is most readily admitted in optional roles, while, when one feels there is little choice, negative feelings remain covert and are displaced. The more critical a role is to the maintenance and survival of society, the greater the likelihood that ambivalence will be repressed or negative sanctions will be applied to its expression. Women can show ambivalence to the work role, while men can not. Both men and women are expected to marry and have children, but once these roles are added, women are more "rooted" to them. Put in absolute terms, "while man's strait jacket during socialization is occupational choice and achievement, woman's strait jacket is marriage" (Angrist, 1969, p. 224).

Of course, role prescriptions are not this rigid. Both men and women are expected to fill multiple roles, and the pluralism of implicit goals allows flexibility in role performance (Podell, 1966). Still, I believe it is fair to suggest that the most dominant roles in the role constellations of men and women are work roles and family roles, respectively. For example, M. Rosenberg (1957) found that three times as many college men as women expected a career to represent their major life satisfaction, and, while 52 percent of the women did not expect to be working in 10 years, this was true of only .5 percent of the men. Masih (1967) found men were significantly more likely than women to be highly career-salient. The greatest number of women in the sample were in the lowest third on career salience. She also judged the low salience women to be considerably less career-motivated than the men in the low group. In the most recent study that compares career salience in men and women, Greenhaus (1971) also found women score significantly lower than do men. While a contemporary study might find the amount of difference in career salience has decreased, the basic pattern of work role dominance among men would probably still appear.

While both male and female roles pose problems for those who try to perform them, female roles lead to special conflicts for women. First, as Kluckhohn (1953) pointed out long ago, the normative definition of the female role is based on a value system very different from the dominant American value system. The dominant value system emphasizes a future-orientation, while, in their role as culture-bearers, women are the preservers of tradition. America values individualism, while women, in their domestic roles, are dedicated to group goals. Individual achievement, "doing", is valued highly. While women set high standards for performance in feminine sex role appropriate tasks, these tasks are social and affiliative in nature (Bardwick, 1971; Stein and Bailey, 1973).

These variant values place women in a double bind in which they can not meet the role requirements of the more socially desirable achieving individual and those of the ideal woman simultaneously (Horner, 1970; Hunt and Hunt, 1975; O'Leary, 1974). As Mead (1955) summarized this dilemma, "each step forward in work as a successful American regardless of sex means a step back as a woman . . ." (p. 240).

It is the internal and external role conflict that arises out of this double message that has been the focus of concern in many studies of educated women. The particular problems of this subgroup of women are described by Horner (1970):

> A peculiar paradox arises in the society because we have an educational system that ostensibly encourages and prepares men and women identically for careers that social, and, even more importantly, internal psychological pressures really limit to men. (p. 45)

The result of this inability to reconcile individual achievement and femininity is that "whereas men are unsexed by failure, women seem to be unsexed by success" (Horner, 1970, p. 55).

Komarovsky's (1946, 1953) classic studies of the sex role conceptions of college women use a role conflict framework, while other researchers suggest that the fact that so many young women seem to be able to ignore inconsistencies between their role behavior and attitudes indicates that their situation must be more flexible than conflicted (e.g., Angrist, 1966, 1969; Lewis, 1969; Podell, 1966; Wallin, 1950). The question of whether inconsistencies must be perceived as conflicts by the individual in order to be defined as role conflicts is a main source of disagreement among those who do and do not consider women to be conflicted. For example, Wallin (1950) suggests that the problems of college women are not so serious since conflicting expectations from different groups of significant others and inconsistent demands from one group are not taken seriously, do not lead to resentment of the reference groups involved. The assumption that only if inconsistencies are perceived do they have behavioral consequences seems somewhat questionable. Unrecognized conflicts, represented by mutually exclusive role expectations, may be more important than recognized ones, precisely because the individual is not conscious of them, and, thus, can not attempt to exert control over such conflicts.

A second special problem inherent in the female role is that, since it is other-directed, a young woman must remain flexible and has a difficult time planning for her future life. The psychological consequence is a pattern of "blocking" at the stage of identity diffusion rather than integration (Erikson, 1959), as described by

Douvan (1970):

> The girl is encouraged to remain fluid and ambiguous in self-definition and to orient towards an external audience for a reflected sense of self, for cues in making judgments, and for the acceptance that will anchor her self-esteem. (p. 38)

The consequence for life planning, particularly career planning, is the adoption of a contingency orientation, involving planning for future occurrences that can not be accurately predicted by allowing for flexibility in role expectations. Angrist (1969) identifies the contingencies faced by the middle and upper class college-educated woman to be the following: 1) preparation to "fit" an unknown spouse (also see Douvan, 1960), 2) lack of a guarantee that she will marry, 3) possibility of an economic necessity to work even if she marries, 4) temporary or permanent childlessness, 5) children grow up and leave home, eliminating mothering roles, and 6) loss of her spouse. Thus, many women plan for work as a "just in case", optional role. Rossi (1964) decries this tendency:

> To study and to prepare for a future job "in case I have to work" is just as poor a preparation for occupational participation as the postponement of learning domestic skills "until I have to" is a poor preparation for the homemaker role. Both views reflect a digging in of the heels into the adolescent moment of a lifetime. In many ways the middle class girl considers only the present, the here-and-now, as do most members of the working class, and not the future, as do her father brother, and male friends. (p. 117)

Angrist and Almquist (1975) feel contingency planning is a realistic, adaptive way to prepare for an unknown future, although agreeing that one of the results of such planning and treating the work role as optional is that women tend to change their career plans often and treat them as tentative and revocable (Angrist, 1969; Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Bailyn, 1964; Ginzberg et al., 1951).

A third important dimension of the female role is that it is really a role constellation, as is the male role, encompassing multiple roles with different expectations associated with each. Angrist (1969) suggests that we should accept the normalcy of any person, male or female, being involved in multiple role relationships simultaneously, with roles having different temporal and spatial priorities. Playing multiple roles increases the opportunities for flexibility in the definition of the requirements of any one role and allows for more individualistic role performance.

However, as D. Hall (1972) points out, what distinguishes the multiple roles of women and men is that women face the demands of multiple roles *simultaneously.* He feels that the most important source of strain for married women is interrole conflict. Married women, whether they place high value on a work role or not, face major problems due to role overload. The options of reducing potential conflict through using time and situation as dividing lines between performance of different roles, or avoiding the expectations of "role senders" (husbands and children) are not easily available coping strategies for women. While men have no fewer subidentities than women, their roles are salient at different times.

Consider the case of the working mother. While a man's work role is a crucial component of his family role (Parsons and Bales, 1955; Rosenberg, 1957), women who work, especially those who *choose* to work, are adding an optional role to their primary family roles. In most cases, they take on the work role without any change in the nature of expectations others hold for adequate performance of their other roles (e.g., see Poloma and Garland, 1971). If a woman desires to be continuously involved in work and wants to advance in her job, she finds that the point at which she is expected to "prove herself" through diligent effort in her job is also the point when her childrearing responsibilities are the most demanding. Even if her husband is willing to share some of her family roles, she remains "the psychological parent," whose work role commitment is tentative and revocable in times of crisis (Skolnick, 1978).

The final major problem with the female role is that the normative demands of the role are out of step with the actual desires and behavior of women. Although expectations are changing, I still feel that the following comment about sex roles is applicable today. In 1946, Komarovsky noted that "sometimes culturally defined roles are adhered to in the face of new conditions, without a conscious realization of the discrepancies involved" (p. 184).

For some women, these discrepancies are consciously recognized. Both Powell and Bloom (1962) and Hoffman and Hoeflin (1972) note a tendency for young women to prefer future activities different from their expectations, with the preference increasingly being to have more than one goal in the future, rather than only focussing on marital and parenthood roles (also see Bronzaft, 1974). Hall and Gordon (1973) found that among married women, whether employed or not, home pressures are the most important source of role conflict, and are most likely to lead to low satisfaction and low happiness.

Thus, there is some suggestion that women are not very happy with the normative definition of their female role. Also, today they are less likely to treat their work role as optional, as indicated by the great increase in the proportion of women (46 percent), married women (43 percent), and mothers (46 percent) who work (U.S. Department of Labor, 1975). We are experiencing a period of cultural lag, in which the normative definitions of the female role have not kept up with the actual work participation or work preferences of women.

Implications of Female Role Norms for Understanding Women's Career Decisions

This brief description of the dimensions of the female role and the problems that are built into role expectations suggests issues that an adequate approach to understanding young women's career decisions must consider. First, the facts that the female role is a constellation of roles and that women seem to plan for the optional work role contingent on the nature of the other roles they will enact, suggest that women plan a life style, not just a career. Based on their longitudinal study of one group of college women, Angrist and Almquist (1975) make this observation:

> . . . Women's career aspirations must be viewed as integral to life style choices and commitments. Study of occupational choice alone obliterates the complexity of women's realistic attempt to anticipate and juggle with their many roles. Thus, occupational choice is merely a minor aspect of career aspirations for women. Instead, measurement of career aspirations should take into account both the role mutiplicity that women anticipate and the changeability of their preferences. (p. 69)

This statement highlights the point that, because the work role still is normatively optional, the crucial vocational choice for women is the decision of whether to work at all, not the choice of a particular occupation (also see Kriger, 1971, 1972; Matthews, 1970).

Regardless of their theoretical persuasion, vocational choice theorists have been singularly unsuccessful in explaining or predicting the occupational choices of women.[1] I would suggest that this problem is due to the fact that for many women, their interest in work is tentative, contingent on not realizing other more important goals, and thus, their occupational planning may be relatively haphazard or geared towards meeting group goals rather than individual needs. For those women who decide to redefine the work role as a primary role, this important departure from normative female role expectations, and the planning necessary to juggle two primary roles, may require all their energies, leaving the choice of a particular occupational goal as a secondary consideration.

As the Angrist and Almquist statement also implies, the concept of life style planning and women's tendency to approach future decisions with a contingency orientation suggest that to understand career decisions, one must also understand and measure the conceptions women have of other roles in their role constellation, especially the dominant family ones. Although the most typical view may still be that life plans revolve around one's family situation (Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Scott, 1974), those women who value a career as a primary life goal, and especially those who see work as a source of personal satisfaction, may turn their learned contingency orientation to the redefinition of conceptions of family roles.

---

[1] See Osipow (1968) for a review of vocational development theories and their relevance to women's concerns. The issue of the relevance of career choice theories to women's occupational decision making is considered in more detail in the section on career choice in the latter part of this chapter.

D. Hall (1972) has suggested a model of three types of coping strategies used by adult women to reduce role conflict that might be adapted to evaluate the plans of young women. The first, which he views as "true coping", is structural role redefinition, similar to Goode's (1960) role bargains. This coping strategy involves changing the objective reality of one's roles in some way, such as coming to a mutual agreement with role senders to revise expectations, or reallocating and sharing role tasks with others. This method allows for the reduction of experienced role overload and conflict between oneself and others in the role network, while simultaneously maintaining all one's roles and satisfying the expectations of others.

The second type of coping strategy, personal role redefinition, involves changing one's personal expectations or perceptions of one's own behavior. For example, one might try to establish priorities among role demands, separate roles through sequential performance, eliminate roles, or attempt to ignore role expectations. This approach requires giving one's personal role-conceptions greater weight than the expectations of others. Since it involves no actual change in others' expectations, Hall views the personal form of coping as a defense providing only short term relief from overload, and leading eventually to greater role press from others in the role network.

The third coping strategy is reactive role behavior, in which one assumes that role expectations are unchangeable and must be met and tries to find ways to meet all role demands. Women who choose this strategy emphasize their attempts to deal with overload by planning and organizing better, working harder, or passively waiting for "time to take care of it." This strategy increases role strain rather than reducing overload, and places more value on the expectations of others than on one's own needs.

Applying this model to the behavior of a sample of college-educated, adult women, Hall found that, regardless of employment status or number of roles enacted, use of the first two coping strategies was positively, though not significantly related to higher satisfaction with one's role constellation, while dependence on the reactive strategy was significantly, negatively correlated with degree of satisfaction. Having any coping strategy was more important than the particular type of strategy employed suggesting that ". . . the first stage in the adaptive process may be the simple decision to cope actively, rather than being controlled completely by role demands" (p. 485). Hall suggests that women, who are socialized to rely on more reactive, less aggressive coping mechanisms (Bem and Bem, 1969), may need to go through all three stages of coping: first, deciding to try to do something about the overload; then, working out their preferred personal role conceptions; and finally, confronting others and trying to change their role expectations.

I have described this typology of coping strategies in detail because I believe it provides a model for evaluating the life style aspirations of young women. If a woman chooses to value a career highly, and her aspirations are realistic, she should have some plans for a woman to have a career. Other coping mechanisms are available, with the role conflict resolution process being a lifelong task that is only just begun in the prospective coping of college women. As Counselman (1971) explains, "vocational development for women is best examined as an ongoing process of seeking equilibrium in one's life between career and family . . ." (abstract).

Measuring Career Salience in Women

Because the literature on the vocational development of women has focussed on career choice, there is no common definition or accepted measurement procedure for the construct career salience. Researchers have used varying labels to describe the construct, have not distinguished between working and having a career, and often have depended on unidimensional measures.

The labels career orientation, career aspirations, career interests, career commitment, and career salience have been used interchangeably to describe the construct of interest here. All of these terms refer to the degree to which individuals consider work plans as an important factor in all life decisions. It is important to note that career salience is an attitudinal construct, not a measure of behavior. Also, it may be necessary to have different terms to describe the attitudes of women aspiring to career roles and of those currently working.

I would suggest that an accurate label would emphasize the concept of the importance of career plans relative to other life goals. As suggested in the preceding discussion of the normative dimensions of the female role constellation, women do not choose a career, they choose a life style. In deciding to want or not want a career outside the home, they must balance career needs against the satisfaction expected from other areas of involvement, such as home and family. I have chosen to use the term career salience in this research. Fogarty et al. (1971) define salience as the importance attached to different areas of one's life and the degree to which one expects to obtain personal satisfaction from these areas. The terms career aspirations and career interests do not emphasize the relative importance of a career and are confusing as they also are used extensively in the career choice literature. The term career orientation often is used to imply orientation towards one alternative and away from another, the dichotomy usually being between career and homemaking orientations. Since such a dichotomy is neither descriptive of most women's aspirations or actual life styles, I feel the term is an invalid summary of the construct. Ultimately, what most researchers are hoping to predict is career commitment, that is, who will maintain their career involvement throughout life. I feel that this term best describes the behavior of adult women whose aspirations have been tested by experience. Career salience may lead to career commitment, or it may change with changing circumstances.

A further definitional issue has to do with the use of the term career rather than job. A career is defined by two components. The first is a high degree of commitment, defined as a sense of high personal involvement and motivation (Fogarty et al., 1971; Gross, 1958; McClelland et al., 1953; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971a; Theodore, 1971; Werts, 1966a). The second component of a career is its developmental quality. Having a career involves a relatively orderly, continuous progression from one job or stage to the next with increased responsibility and prestige at each stage (Fogarty et al., 1971; Gross, 1967; McClelland et al., 1953; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971a; Theodore, 1971; Wilensky, 1961). Theodore (1971) points out that it is difficult to apply this part of the definition of a career to women, as work and career are often indistinguishable in their perceptions. For women, the importance of work changes more in response to life cycle stages, and career discontinuity is common. Theodore (1971) and R. Turner (1964a, 1964b) suggest that women don't view their careers as a means for raising social status or exerting influence over others, depending on their husbands' careers to meet these needs. Since women have not received the socialization to career that men receive, it may be difficult to apply "career" in a developmental sense to their work aspirations.

A job refers to any gainful employment. Jobs are viewed as work performed solely for economic reasons, bringing fewer rewards because of the lack of personal commitment (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971a). Following this emphasis on the commitment distinction, W. Moore (1969) defines two approaches to work: conditioning, described as reluctant adjustment to harsh reality, and commitment, an enthusiastic acceptance of pleasurable duties. Since the commitment mode of work involvement is of concern here, it seems appropriate to use the word career.

In general, researchers have been lax in defining the concepts they are using and simplistic in measurement procedures. This is partially attributable to the preliminary nature of work in this area.

We are just beginning to build a literature from which we can refine an adequate definition and measures of the concept, career salience. The very complexity of a concept that requires determining the relative importance of a career and assumes a model of life style planning suggests that an adequate measure must be multidimensional. Single question measures are suspect from the standpoint of validity as well as reliability. If one agrees that the concept is multidimensional, we introduce the problem of distinguishing between correlates and components of career salience. Women who are career salient may share other behavioral and attitudinal attributes which distinguish them from other women but which are not direct measures of career salience. I would suggest that only measures that concern career plans and/or concern one's relative emphasis on family and career goals should be considered as components of career salience. Finally, I feel it is important to measure the career salience of an individual based on evidence of that person's specific values and plans for herself, not for women in general. I would expect career salience to be correlated with general ideology, but I do not feel that ideology should be part of a measure that one hopes will have utility for predicting individual plans.

Few of the measures presented in the literature meet the criteria of being multidimensional, stressing career plans and relative emphasis on family and career goals, and including only the subjects' personal plans and values. Only a handful of researchers have experimented with multidimensional measures and conceptual schemes. Other studies use three general types of measures: unidimensional measures of the relative importance of career and family, single question measures of one's attitude toward or interest in having a career, and career choice measures that assume certain career choices imply more or less career salience.

The most common dimensions included in the available multidimensional measures of career salience are the relative importance of career compared to other sources of life satisfaction and the desire to work regardless of other life circumstances. The relative importance of a career usually is measured by asking women to choose their preferred involvements from a list of options covering work, family, volunteer, and leisure activities, with career salience equated with primacy assigned to work-related choices (Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Baruch et al., 1967; Cowan and Moore, 1971; Greenhaus, 1973; Masih, 1967; Richardson, 1972, 1974). Sedney and Turner (1975) used such a measure as their definition of career salience. I believe that the most valid measures of this type are those that acknowledge that one can play multiple roles simultaneously, forcing women to choose some limited number of activities, as one must do in real life, but not requiring that women choose work to the exclusion of all other interests in order to be considered career-salient.

Eyde's (1962, 1968) Desire to Work scale, which considers a woman's desire to work under various combinations of the adequacy of the husband's salary and the ages and number of children, or some variant of this index, is used to measure the desire to work dimension in a number of the multidimensional measures of career salience (Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Cowan and Moore, 1971; Fogarty et al., 1971; Metzger et al., 1969; Richardson, 1972, 1974) and serves as the definition of career salience in a number of studies using unidimensional indexes (Counselman, 1971; Dodson, 1973; Erickson and Nordin, 1974; Levine, 1968, 1975; Simpson and Simpson, 1961; Stein, 1973; Veres, 1974). While Eyde's scale is designed to elucidate the relative strength of the desire to work, a number of these researchers do not take advantage of its summative properties, but equate career salience with wanting to work after marriage or childbearing, and lack of salience, usually described as a homemaking orientation, with any compromise of career involvement for family responsibilities.

Another type of measure of the desire to work asks women to choose one among a series of role preferences representing various combinations of career and family responsibilities (Cook, 1967; Hoyt and Kennedy, 1958; Oliver, 1974; B. Turner, 1972). While all these studies use such a measure as their definition of career salience, Mulvey (1961) uses a similar conceptualization, based on the actual multiple roles played by adult women, as one dimension in her multidimensional measure. Many of these measures assume that there is a linear progression of degree of career salience implicit in the role alternatives, with the choice of a career only, without marriage, indicative of the most career salience. While this choice might make it easier to maintain career involvement, it may be a measure of negative feelings about marriage as much as a measure of the attitude towards a career. Thus, although these measures allow for consideration of types of role conflict resolution, their construction, and the researchers' proclivity for lumping women who choose different alternatives into career and homemaking groups, indicate that they suffer from the common assumption that career and homemaking are mutually exclusive role alternatives.

Other measures of the overall importance of a career are less common. Angrist and Almquist (1975) and Cowan and Moore (1971) include a self-concept measure, whether a woman prefers to see herself as a career woman in the future, as one of the dimensions of career salience. Vetter and Lewis (1964) use a self-identification measure, asking women to place themselves on an 11 point Thurstone scale with homemaker and career as the poles. Mulvey (1961) also includes a self-identification dimension. Rand (1968) and Schmidt (1970) categorize women as career- or homemaking-oriented depending on whether they consider finding or training for a vocation to be more important than finding a mate. Bell and Bodden (1972) depend on interviewer judgment to assess career commitment versus revocability, with the main criterion being whether a woman views her career as subject to her husband's needs. All but the multidimensional measures suffer from oversimplification and exhibit the fallacious reasoning that one must choose marriage-home-family or career.

Several of the unidimensional measures equate the presence of career aspirations or interests with career salience. Typically, the aspiration measures are single questions concerning whether one wants to have a career or whether a career is an important goal (For example, see Farley, 1970; M. Freedman, 1967; Kinnane and Bannon, 1964; R. Turner, 1964b). While these measures have face validity, they do not elucidate the relative importance of career in one's total life style, and introduce reliability issues due to the single question format and the possibility that respondents will focus on answering in a socially desirable way.

A number of researchers have used the women's form of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) to measure career orientation, considering the number of interests expressed (Heilbrun, 1969) or the choice of "career" interests over "homemaking" interests (based on the correlation of individual interest items with the "housewife" scale) as indicative of career salience (Ginn, 1968; R. Johnson, 1970; Nuzum, 1970; B. White, 1959). The literature criticizing the validity and reliability of the SVIB and other vocational interest inventories, particularly for use in predicting anything about women's career involvement, is mammoth (see Peoples, 1975 for an adequate review). A telling criticism of its use in measuring career salience is that Harmon (1969), who has used the SVIB-W extensively, concludes that, while the SVIB may be accurate in predicting career choice, it is not useful in predicting who will be career-committed.

Several of the multidimensional indexes include some measure of general attitudes towards work in their definition of career salience, with most focussing on whether work is anticipated with positive or negative affect (Bailyn, 1970; Baruch et al., 1967; Fogarty et al., 1971; Greenhaus, 1973; Masih, 1967; Mulvey, 1961). Baruch et al.'s (1967) work, which is relevant, though not actually focussed on career salience, also considers specific reasons for working. Angrist and Almquist's (1975) measure is the only one that includes a work value, the importance of freedom from supervision, as a dimension of career salience.

Several researchers include some aspect of the occupational choice process in their measures of career salience. In the multidimensional measures, aspects of occupational choice considered definitive components of career salience include aspiring to high status occupations (Metzger et al., 1969; Richardson, 1972, 1974), choosing a male-dominated occupation (Horner, 1969; Richardson, 1972, 1974; Rossi, 1965a, 1965c, 1972), and expressing great concern with career advancement or occupational planning (Greenhaus, 1973; Masih, 1967). Some of the unidimensional measures equate certain types of career choices with career salience. For example, Astin (1968a, 1968b) and Astin and Myint (1971) say that women who aspire to work in the sciences, professions, and teaching are career-oriented by definition, while those who aspire to office work are grouped with the housewife aspirants as noncareer-oriented. R. White (1971) defines career commitment as identification with a particular occupation, measured by congruence between the self-concept and the occupational role concept on a rating scale of attributes. Masih (1967) also measures degree of identification with one's occupational choice as one dimension of career salience.

One problem with including some aspect of the occupational choice and planning process in a measure of career salience is that there is little agreement as to what dimensions of occupational choice are relevant. Also, there is contradictory evidence suggesting that occupational choice processes are not components of career salience. For example, Angrist and Almquist (1975) tested hypotheses that suggest that career-salient women should prefer professional work, be decided about what occupation they will pursue, and choose male-dominated occupations, but found no strong relationships between these variables and other dimensions of career salience. Richardson (1972, 1974) used cluster analysis to define the components of career orientation. She found that 14 career orientation variables defined two independent clusters of concerns, labelled career orientation and work orientation. While, as indicated above, some occupational choice dimensions fell into the career orientation cluster, those concerning amount of occupational information possessed, evidence of occupational planning, and certainty about a particular occupational choice were components of a work orientation. These data suggest that one can be career-salient without even having a definite career choice, leading one to question those measures that require identification with an occupation as a definitive component of career salience. In fact, Masih (1967), who includes such a dimension in her definition, notes that the judges rating her interview protocols had more difficulty placing women into high, medium, and low career salience groups than was the case for men, because women showed greater confusion about goals and a lesser degree of identification with their current choice. This problem suggests another explanation of the lack of agreement about the relevance of occupational choice dimensions to the measurement of career salience in women. Emphasis on occupational choice favors the model of the vocational development of men, whose primary concern is the choice of a particular occupation, while women first must decide whether to work at all.

Finally, a number of the multidimensional measures of career salience include high educational aspirations as a condition for high career salience (Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Horner, 1969; Metzger et al., 1969; Rand, 1968; Richardson, 1972, 1974; Rossi, 1965a, 1965c, 1972). While the data indicating a strong relationship between educational aspirations and other dimensions of career salience is quite definitive, the educational plans component does not have any specific career content. Also, those measures that require high educational aspirations and/or choice of a high status job imply that only professionals can be career-salient.

Along with the only partial agreement as to the validity of including specific content dimensions in a definition and measure of career salience, there also are problems of reliability and validity introduced by the particular types of measurement devices used. As a group, the unidimensional measures have been criticized throughout this review as inadequately summarizing the multifaceted nature of career salience. Also, many of these measures inaccurately portray the nature of women's aspirations, considering homemaking and career as polar opposites or mutually exclusive life choices. Usually based on responses to only one question, these measures also are questionable from the standpoint of reliability because they make no allowance for the possibility of measurement error.

While not suffering from this problem, many of the multidimensional indexes use measurement procedures that lead one to question their reliability or validity. For example, Angrist and Almquist's (1975) Life Style Index, which comes closest to meeting the suggested criteria for an adequate measure of career salience, is weighted heavily towards the desire to work measures, with various child and salary conditions comprising seven of the total of 11 items in the index. This weighting introduces the possibility of measurement error due to response set and implies that the desire to work is more important than other components, although this contention is not tested. Metzger et al. (1969) carry the tendency to group women into career and homemaking groups one step farther by using different measures to delineate who is homemaking-oriented than those used to determine who is career-committed. Such a procedure simply validates my contention that such orientations are not poles on the same continuum, and suggests that a comparison of the groups according to degree of career commitment is not valid. Greenhaus' (1973) measure, a 27 item Likert scale, facilitates index construction, but introduces the possibility of response set bias. Bailyn's (1970) measure, while based on responses to two questions, is really unidimensional, since both items concern attitudes towards work, with one item being a measure of ideology, one's opinion of whether married women should work, rather than personal behavior.

Data for several of the multidimensional measures are obtained through methods that require a great deal of subjective interpretation of responses. Masih (1967) depends on judges to extract career-salient content from interview protocols. Baruch et al. (1967) use a TAT with family and work components to measure issues related to career salience. Mulvey (1961)'s complex conceptualization requires grouping women along three basic dimensions, one of which is itself multidimensional, and then crossclassifying these dimensions into 12 categories that summarize different attitudes towards solutions to role conflict.

While each of these measures has some theoretical support, the methods used are not easily replicable and the categories are diffuse and open to subjective interpretation.

This critique of measures of career salience aids further specification of the meaning of the construct. There is general agreement that career salience may be defined as the degree to which women view work as a high priority, relatively continuous activity, regardless of other life circumstances, particularly one's family situation. It concerns the degree to which women assign career goals importance relative to the weighting of other sources of life satisfaction, and the degree to which they are willing to compromise or reduce involvement in other areas, where necessary, to further career interests.

There is less agreement on the relevance of other possible dimensions to a definition of a career salience. Educational aspirations, attitudes towards working, and various aspects of occupational choice have been included as definitive components in various measures of career salience. I believe that the way to resolve these differences is to consider the available evidence as to how consistently and strongly these variables are related to career salience when the construct itself does not include them. If the correlative evidence is relatively incontrovertible, further testing of whether the measured attitudes form one construct is required. The review of the literature on the correlates of career salience considers this problem, but one must keep in mind that if the measures of career salience are themselves faulty, all the evidence is not yet in.

Competing Explanations of Sources of Career Salience in Women

A central dichotomy emerges in the literature that tries to explain the development of career salience in women.[2] High career salience is explained by many as a sign of deviance or compensation. The career-salient woman is described as having a poor self-concept or "masculine" personality, as being maladjusted and unhappy. Her focus on a career is ascribed to rejection by parents or peers, especially male peers. For example, Lidz (1968) asserts that

> women do not usually need to prove themselves through accomplishment and achievement, and gain more satisfaction from being admired and loved because of who they are, or because of what they can give . . . . (p. 383)
>
> There are, of course, a number of women who will pursue more masculine careers for a variety of reasons, sometimes because they cannot come to terms with their feminine identity and wish to compete with and surpass men, but also often from fears of marriage and childbirth, or of the dangers of dependency. (p. 352)

An alternative explanation suggests that the career-salient woman is the product of different and enriching experiences. She is pictured as having been socialized differently than other women due to family norms emphasizing achievement and the development of competence, and interaction with a wider variety of role models outside the family. Angrist and Almquist (1975) point out the contrast in tone of these two explanations:

> Is it prudent to argue that the deviant content of a young woman's ambitions necessarily stems from "abnormal" personality characteristics? Society's values do stamp strong career

---

[2] I am indebted to Angrist and Almquist (1975) for the suggestion of this conceptualization.

> aspirations as different, unusual, at variance with accepted standards, but less and less so; and this does not mean that the person who has such plans is herself abnormal, maladjusted or conflicted.
>
> The negative slant of the deviance hypothesis contrasts sharply with the enrichment view, which places career planning and occupational choice within the context of role learning and projects positive inducements for turning toward career. In the enrichment hypothesis, career is not a solution to personal conflict but a positive choice growing out of differential learning situations and influences from important references groups. (p. 184)

These comments highlight the central difference between the deviance and enrichment hypotheses. The deviance hypothesis assumes the validity of the normative descriptions of the female role and supposes that women must exhibit "feminine" personality characteristics in order to be well-adjusted. For example, we are told that there is a basic "feminine core" to women's identity, the needs of which are not met by career involvement (Deutsch, 1944; Matthews, 1957; Tiedeman, 1959; Zytowski, 1969). E. Lewis (1968), one of the most often cited deviance proponents, states quite clearly that "the road to good adjustment, for women, is that which stays within the traditional feminine role . . ." (p. 34). Such views are a problem if, as I have suggested, we currently are experiencing a period of cultural lag in which norms have not changed as rapidly as women's aspirations and actual career involvement. Concerning statements about adjustment, one must ask adjusted to what? A continuing anomaly in the psychological literature describes well-adjusted women differently from well-adjusted human beings, a category judged by "masculine" criteria.

A chronological review of the literature lends credence to the view that the deviance hypothesis depends on outmoded norms for the female role. There is an interesting trend in the literature, with deviance explanations being more popular in earlier research, while enrichment interpretations predominate in more recent material. This also suggests that the dichotomy may be more apparent than real. It is not clear whether these divergent explanations are due to differences in research findings or only to differences in interpretation. The latter suggestion is supported by the tendency for the author's discipline to correlate with the nature of the interpretation of the meaning of strong career commitment. Psychologists seem more likely to choose deviance explanations, while sociologists interpret similar findings as evidence of differential socialization.

In general, the literature on women's career development shows a psychological bias. Psychologists have made major contributions to our understanding of women's career concerns, while sociologists have neglected this research area. This differential attention explains the emphasis on individual interests and personality needs in the explanation of career orientations. Where attention is paid to the influence of social constraints, poor measurement has invalidated attempts to measure or control for the effects of such factors. I believe that the dependence on psychological inventories, which assume a "feminine" norm of adjustment, has led to the description of career-salient women as deviant. Sociological input is needed, particularly in explaining that cultural norms are relative and open to change.

In any case, we do not have to depend as heavily on interpretation as some researchers have. It is possible to test the validity of the components of the deviance and enrichment hypotheses. Few researchers have tested these theories directly (Angrist and Almquist, 1975; and Sedney and Turner, 1975 being exceptions), but it is possible to consider the evidence concerning the specific components of the two explanations. I will do so in the discussion sections of the literature review and data analysis that follow, pointing out whether specific findings support the deviance or enrichment hypotheses. At some point, however, interpretation of the facts is necessary. When it is, I will try to avoid culture-bound interpretations and "feminine" assumptions. Where evidence of conflict or unhappiness is uncovered in a significant proportion of the population, this may be a reflection of problems inherent in the definition of female roles rather than a matter of individual pathology.

Correlates of Career Salience in Women

Age

One might expect that a woman's age, and the vicissitudes of the particular life stage through which she is passing, would affect her attitudes towards career involvement. In fact, one of the constant verities about women's actual career involvement is its cyclical, discontinuous quality over a lifetime (see for example Sobol, 1963; Theodore, 1971).

There is some evidence that degree of interest in a career is distinguishable as early as the early teens (Rand and Miller, 1972; Tyler, 1964), although Matthews and Tiedeman (1964) describe the junior high surge as a "pseudo career drive" that is displaced by later interest in "male attachment." The career concerns of college-age women may be better predictors of actual career involvement as, while they have not yet made clear and irrevocable career and family commitments, these choices are close enough to infuse their aspirations with more realism than those of younger women. Still, we can expect continued change and vacillation during the college period. College women are adolescents involved in forging an individual identity, part of which will be their degree of identification with and commitment to a career (see for example, Bettelheim, 1963; Y. Cohen, 1964; Eisenstadt, 1956, 1963; Erikson, 1959, 1963). They, especially freshmen, are not at the definite decision points. Angrist (1969) and Angrist and Almquist (1975) report that, in their longitudinal study of one college cohort, vacillation in career salience was the rule rather than the exception, although noncareer-oriented women showed less shifting. Lehman et al. (1966) report that women change more in college than do men. On the other hand, M. Freedman (1967) suggests that, at least for upper-middle-class women, the college years bring little crisis of identity; the pathways of their lives are clearly marked.

Most of the evidence suggests that something happens during the college years that affects career salience, though whether the effect is due to the impact of the college experience or to maturation, and whether the result is to dilute or heighten career interests is not clear. Simpson and Simpson (1961) found no age differences. M. Freedman (1967) and Cross (1968) report a downward trend in level of career aspiration and degree of interest in a career over the four years. On the other hand, Harmon (1970) and Wolfson (1972) agree that career commitment is established sometime after entrance to college, though they do not pinpoint the crucial change period. Rand and Miller (1972) suggest that as women grow older, they become more liberal in their attitudes and desires towards work. Schmidt (1970) found that seniors were more likely than freshmen to stress the importance of a vocation over that of finding a mate. Using a more adequate definition of career salience, Angrist and Almquist (1975) discovered that career salience increases over the four years of college.

Only Angrist and Almquist (1975) have tried to elucidate exactly when the crucial change period, and thus, the best point for intervention and guidance, occurs during the college career. They discovered a gradual increase in career salience from the freshman to junior years, followed by an abrupt ascent between the junior and senior years. Overall, the most change in attitudes occurs during the freshman and early senior years.

Still, there are important post-college change periods as well, particularly in the first five years after college when women actually feel the pressures of marriage-career conflict (Eyde, 1968; Wolfson, 1972). Experience may temper the expectations of college graduates. Rossi (1965b) contrasts these effects on pioneers, women who aspire to male-dominated occupations, and women who aspire to being homemakers:

> . . . the pioneers have romantic notions concerning careers and work which the reality of advanced study and employment temper, and the homemakers have romantic notions concerning marriage and family roles which the reality of marriage and motherhood tempers. (p. 81)

In general, studies that have contrasted the effects of contemporaneous and antecedent conditions find that the current situation a woman finds herself in has more effect on career salience and actual work commitment than do earlier influences (Mulvey, 1961; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971b; Wolfson, 1972).

The evidence that exists suggests that it is difficult to predict career involvement based on attitudes held in college (Harmon, 1970; Levitt, 1972; Wolfson, 1972). However, little longitudinal evidence is available. Follow-up of the Project Talent study group and Angrist's Carnegie-Mellon cohort will be important in this regard. Also, too much of the data available is based on studies of freshmen, and the evidence summarized above suggests that attitudes during the senior year may have more predictive validity.

Ability

The evidence as to the effects of academic ability on career salience is mixed, with differences probably due to varying definitions of career salience and different ability measures. In general, it would appear that ability makes little difference. Some researchers report no relationship between ability and career salience (Almquist and Angrist, 1971; Birnbaum, 1971; Harmon, 1970; Mulvey, 1961, Oliver, 1974; Parker, 1966; Witkin, 1973). Others find a positive relationship between aptitude or achievement measures and career salience for college women (Astin, 1968a, 1968b; Astin and Myint, 1971; Metzger et al., 1969; Tyler, 1964) or for work patterns of adult women (Rossman, 1963; Watley, 1969). Although Angrist and Almquist (1975) report no overall relationship between these two variables, they did find that, for converts to career during the sophomore or junior years, grades rise sharply when they convert. They suggest that this reflects a mirroring process:

> The converts seem to be reminded, via their academic performance, that they are bright and therefore ought to pursue careers. This is a kind of mirroring effect, involving the student's performance, the teacher's view of that performance, and the student's view of the teacher's view . . . ! (p. 164)

Only one study reports a negative relationship between achievement and career salience. Vetter and Lewis (1964) suggest that more intelligent students set more realistic goals for themselves, realistic meaning homemaking.

It may be that the crucial issue is not measured or perceived ability but one's attitude towards achievement. The evidence on this issue is quite clear, indicating that career-salient women have a stronger need for achievement and more intellectual interests than other women. (R. Baruch, 1967 ; Cook, 1967; Eyde, 1962; M. Freedman, 1967; Greenhaus, 1973; Gysbers et al., 1968; Hanley, 1974; Hoffman, 1963a; Hoyt and Kennedy, 1958; Kriger, 1972, Lueptow, 1975; Masih, 1967; Oliver, 1974; Rand, 1968; Rossi, 1965a, 1965c; Rossman, 1963; Sedney and Turner, 1975). Hanley (1974) and Horner (1969) report lower fear of success scores among career-salient women, a predisposition that might facilitate activation of achievement need.

Educational Attainment and Aspirations

The relationship between career salience and educational attainment or aspirations is systematically found to be positive. In studies that try to measure the relative effect of education and other variables, education consistently is one of the strongest predictors of career salience or actual career involvement.

All studies that consider the issue find higher educational aspirations among career-salient college women than for their peers (Almquist and Angrist, 1971; Angrist, 1971-1972; Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Astin and Myint, 1971; Eyde, 1962; Greenhaus, 1971; Richardson, 1972, 1974, 1975; Watley, 1969; R. White, 1971). R. Turner (1964b) found higher educational ambitions among women who wanted a career only, while those who wanted marriage and a career held intermediate aspirations. R. White (1971) asked women if they would stop their education if they married before finishing. Of those strongly committed to a career, two-thirds to three-fourths said no, while less than one-half of the weakly committed would continue. Angrist and Almquist (1975) found no difference between career- and noncareer-salient women in the value placed on advanced education for women in general. Studies of adult women find a positive relationship between educational attainment and working, continuity of work patterns, and career salience (Astin and Myint, 1971; Eyde, 1962; Ginzberg, 1951; Gysbers et al., 1968; Harmon, 1970; Hoffman, 1963; Mulvey, 1961; Sobol, 1963; Sweet, 1973; Theodore, 1971; U.S. Department of Labor, 1975; Weil, 1961; Wolfson, 1972). The relationship between educational aspirations and career salience is strong and consistent enough to consider these aspirations as an essential component of career salience, as a number of the measures discussed previously have done.

Educational and Occupational Values

Vocational choice theories have explained individual occupational choices as an attempt to implement personal values through work and a number of theorists have tried to predict career salience in women based on evidence of differential values. The evidence as to the existence of such a relationship is mixed and often contradictory. I believe that disagreements are due to inadequacies in the definition of the value constructs, differences in measurement, and lack of consensus about value typologies.

No researchers have considered the relationship between educational values, here defined as beliefs about the functions of an education, and career salience. Since the degree of educational aspirations seems to be important, I feel that the character of these aspirations might also distinguish between career-salient and noncareer-salient women. Havighurst (1968) suggests a dichotomy between the functional value of education and the symbolic value. The former is an instrumental, utilitarian view suggesting that the purpose of an education is vocational preparation which will lead to a better job and greater job security. Those who stress the symbolic value of an education conceive of its function in broader, more "expressive" terms, emphasizing the importance of being exposed to a wide range of experiences, learning to get along with others, and becoming a well-rounded person. Education has a status-enhancing value that accrues to the educated individual whether or not she uses her education in a job.

Considering the reasons women attend college, some researchers have suggested that women view a college education as an insurance policy in case they don't marry (Lewis, 1965), while others maintain that women go to college to find a husband (Wallace, 1966). Cross' (1968) review of several national longitudinal studies of college women concludes that about equal proportions of women stress the importance of securing vocational and professional training, meeting or marrying one's future husband, and developing one's mind and intellectual abilities.

Perrone (1973) defines an occupational value as an ". . . empirically measured tendency to react favorably or unfavorably to certain generalized conceptions about work" (p. 116). Researchers have further specified this general definition to include the rewards, needs, or satisfactions sought by an individual through work. Most researchers operationalize the concept of work values by asking women what qualities they would look for in their ideal job or why they chose a specific occupation. These measures assume that a woman will be working. A conceptually different approach is to ask women why they would work at all. Reasons for choosing to work, while indicative of values, might be very different than reasons for choosing a specific job.[3]

Regardless of measurement procedure, there is little agreement among researchers as to the appropriate categorical schemes for summarizing types of work values, even though sophisticated statistical methods have been brought to bear on this issue. Until some decisive research appears, the individual researcher must resolve the dilemma by letting her typology evolve from the attitudes of the particular sample she is studying.

---

[3] Simpson and Simpson's (1961) study, in which a variety of measures of work values were obtained, indicates that there are different motivating factors at work in these two situations, as well as suggesting that the way the question is posed, whether the questions are closed- or open-ended and whether the number of alternative choices is restricted, affects the findings. Hoffman (1963a) has suggested that in the case of reasons for working, a focussed interview really is necessary to uncover the complexity of motivations involved.

Even though there is disagreement in this area, there is general agreement as to the rewards women seek in their ideal job. Service to others and an interest in working with people consistently are central to the work values of women (J. Davis, 1965; Dixon, 1958; Empey, 1958; Lewis, 1965; Powell and Bloom, 1962; M. Rosenberg, 1957; Singer and Stefflre, 1954b, Wolfe, 1969b). However, women are concerned with other aspects of the job, including the need to derive a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction from work (Crowley et al., 1973; Singer and Stefflre, 1954b; U.S. Department of Labor, 1966; Wolfe, 1969b). Several studies find that women are not very interested in pay or opportunities for advancement (J. Davis, 1965; Dixon, 1958; Empey, 1958; Lewis, 1965; Powell and Bloom, 1962; U.S. Department of Labor, 1966), but Crowley et al. (1973) assert that these are two of the "deadly half-truths" about women. It may be that this is an area where values are changing as women realize their economic potential.

If one asks women why they would work at all, the situation is quite different, with financial reasons comprising from 50 to 90 percent of those cited in most studies (Hewer and Neubeck, 1964; Hoffman, 1963a; Sobol, 1963; U.S. Department of Labor, 1965, 1966; Weil, 1961). Lesser concerns cited in these studies include personal satisfaction, self-actualization, a need for accomplishment, a lack of interest in housework, a desire to use one's education, and a need to occupy time or meet people.

While this seems to be the picture for women in general, there do seem to be some differences between the work values of women who are career-salient and those who are not, although the pattern of these differences is not clear. Looking first at those studies that dichotomize values into intrinsic and extrinsic categories, there is some evidence that career-oriented women place more emphasis on the meeting of intrinsic needs (Richardson, 1972, 1974, 1975; Simpson and Simpson, 1961; R. Turner, 1964b). An emphasis on intrinsic needs also is related to occupational persistence (Meir, 1972) and a longer working period (Pfeil, 1968) among adult women. However, this relationship appears to depend on how one asks the question and how one distinguishes career-salient women. For example, Simpson and Simpson (1961) found that when women were asked to rate the importance of occupational features to job satisfaction, the distinguishing element was that noncareer-oriented women rated a greater number of features as important than did the career-oriented. When they asked women to rank order how much different factors influenced their job choice, the career-oriented stressed intrinsic and extrinsic values. Richardson's (1972, 1974, 1975) research suggests that this may be due to the fact that they did not distinguish between career-oriented and work-oriented women. In Richardson's study, the career-oriented women primarily stressed intrinsic values, while the work-oriented stressed both types of needs.

For the purposes of a summary review of studies that consider more specific value-orientations, I will use M. Rosenberg's (1957) tripartite classification of needs, adding a category of concern with the nature of working conditions. The extrinsic rewards value complex includes concern with income, prestige, security, or living up to one's parents' ideas of success. In general, researchers report no differences between career- and noncareer-salient women in degree of importance attached to these values (Angrist, 1971-1972; Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Bickel, 1969; Masih, 1967; R. Turner, 1964b; Wolfe, 1969a). However, there are some exceptions. Simpson and Simpson (1961) found that noncareer-oriented women generally were more concerned with extrinsic rewards, except for prestige, which is of greater concern to career-salient women (also see Masih, 1967).

The self-expression value-orientation includes concern with having an opportunity to use one's special abilities, being involved in interesting activities, and having the chance to express one's individuality. Some researchers report no difference in emphasis between career- and noncareer-salient women in these areas (Angrist, 1971-1972; Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Masih, 1967), while Simpson and Simpson (1961) report that these concerns are more characteristic of career-oriented women. R. Turner (1964b) suggests that concern with individuality and self-reliance is not true of career-oriented women, though it is descriptive of ambitious women. Sobol (1963) found that a "need for accomplishment" was one of the most important predictors of work commitment among married women, and that women who cited only nonfinancial reasons for working were more likely to work than those who cited a combination of financial and nonfinancial reasons.

The people-orientation value complex includes a preference for working with people and a need to help and serve others through work. The Carnegie-Mellon study (Almquist and Angrist, 1970; Angrist, 1971-1972; Angrist and Almquist, 1975) found no differences, while Simpson and Simpson (1961), M. Rosenberg (1957), and Schissel (1968) report that noncareer-salient women are more people-oriented. In fact, Rossi (1964) and Schissel (1968) report a rejection of people by career-oriented women, who prefer manipulation of things, impersonal relations with people, and solitary pursuits.

The final category of work values, the nature of working conditions, is a catchall grouping of motivations. The Carnegie-Mellon (Almquist and Angrist, 1970; Angrist, 1971-1972; Angrist and Almquist, 1975) and New York State studies (Bickel, 1969; Wolfe, 1969a) report that career-salient and stable working women, respectively, value freedom from supervision and independence more than other women, while Masih (1967) reports no difference. Simpson and Simpson (1961) found that career-oriented women are more concerned with the kind of people in the occupation. Concerning the importance placed on an occupation's ability to facilitate combining career and family, the Simpsons (1961) found more interest in this issue among career-oriented women, while Angrist and Almquist (1975) report no difference.

In summary, the evidence concerning the relationship between the work values of college-age women and career salience is cloudy. One might venture to assert that concern with extrinsic rewards does not distinguish who will be career-salient, but the role of other values is less clear. Some differences in study findings can be explained by methodological idiosyncracies. The contradictions between the Simpson and Simpson and Carnegie-Mellon studies probably are due to the reliability of the methods used, with the latter study being more rigorous in testing for the significance of differences. On the other hand, the lack of agreement in this area may be indicative of a more fundamental issue. As Angrist (1971-1972) suggests, values may be too general and remote from actual life choices to affect interest in a career. I would conclude that values, especially those cited as reasons for choosing a particular job, will not help explain career salience in women. On the other hand, few researchers have considered the relationship between reasons for working at all and career salience, Sobol (1963) being a notable exception. This should be a more relevant area of inquiry since choosing to work is the central component of career salience.

Career Choice and Work Experience

There are a number of divergent theories about how people come to formulate an occupational choice. Central elements of agreement include the contentions that occupational choice is a process that evolves as a series of progressive delimitations of alternatives based on what is socially appropriate, possible, and desirable. The decision is limited by statuses and roles; knowledge of occupational alternatives; and reality factors such as ability, material resources, and opportunities to practice the occupation (M. Rosenberg, 1957). Although most theorists consider the channeling influence of these factors, the bulk of their research efforts have focussed on explaining occupational decisions as an expression of personality, emphasizing the relationship of need structures, value-orientations, and interests to vocational preference.[4] Central to these formulations is Super's (1953) contention that "the process of vocational development is essentially that of the development and implementation of a self concept" (p. 190). As in the case of career salience, the career choice literature has a distinct psychological bias.[5] Researchers have not really explained the fact that one is able to predict career choice with a great deal of accuracy by identifying shared social statuses that define occupational stereotypes, but that do not have any necessary relationship to personality dimensions.

None of the typologies of personality predictors of career choice consistently has explained individual choices (see Bordin et al., 1963; Norton, 1971 for exemplary critiques). They have been particularly unsuccessful in predicting the choices made by women. Early theorists explain this problem by suggesting that occupational decisions are not important to women. For example, Roe (1956) suggests:

> It seems very probable that generally women select their occupations more casually than men do, since for many of them the occupation is not of primary importance. Hence it would be expected that women in different occupations, particularly in nonprofessional ones, would be less differentiable on the basis of their interests or aptitudes than men would be. (p. 91)

---

[4] The most often cited vocational development theories include those formulated by Ginzberg (1952; Ginzberg et al., 1951), Holland (1959, 1966), Roe (1956), Super (1953, 1957), and Tiedeman (1961).

[5] An important exception is the conceptual framework suggested by Blau et al. (1956), but their work has not been adequately developed by other sociologists.

More recently, theorists have suggested that women's choices are rational, but separate explanatory theories must be developed for women (Rose and Elton, 1971). Such theories should consider the possibility that there are more developmental stages for women with a relatively greater complexity of factors operating within any given stage than in the case of men (Falk and Cosby, 1974).

Finally, there is the explanation that I have suggested: that for women, the crucial decision is whether to work at all. Women must justify any kind of career commitment, and one method of doing so may be to choose an occupation considered appropriate for their sex if not for the individual person. The process of matching psychosocial characteristics with the requirements and rewards of a job does not apply for women, whose life circumstances interfere with this opportunity (Almquist and Angrist, 1970). The relationship between career plans and identity development is problematic when there is direct conflict between a person's occupational identity and sex role identity (R. White, 1971). Elsewhere (Guttmacher, 1971) I have suggested that the "environmental press" is greater for women than for men, because in addition to the shared constraints of social forces such as socioeconomic status and individual attributes such as ability, they must contend with the limiting effects of their sex status and role when making an occupational choice. Until women have true freedom of choice in all aspects of career decision making, prediction of their specific occupational choices on the basis of individual characteristics will be an unrewarding line of research.

The contention that sex is an overriding determining factor in the career choices of women is supported by a wealth of evidence. Sex-channeling of occupational choice appears as early as the preschool years (Kirchner and Vandracek, 1973) and women's choices continue to narrow to typical female fields through college (Harmon, 1971). In general, girls develop vocational interests and make tentative choices earlier than boys and have more homogeneous interests (D. Davis, et al., 1962; Norton, 1953; O'Hara, 1962). Several studies support the contention that the "birds of a feather" career choice model, the view that people who share personality attributes, interests, and abilities will cluster together, is not operative for females (J. Davis, 1965; Rosenberg, 1957; Werts and Watley, 1968). Recent studies suggest that women's views of which occupations are acceptable aspirations for other women are becoming more liberal (Medvene and Collins, 1974; Shepard and Hess, 1975), although individual choices have not broadened that much (Astin and Bisconti, 1973). Perhaps the most telling fact is that we see the continuation of sex segregation of occupations in the jobs actually held by women (Gross, 1968; Martin and Postori, 1972).

Perhaps as a career becomes more salient in the life plans of women their career choices will diversify. There is some evidence that degree of career salience does interact with occupational choice processes. Some researchers report that career-oriented women choose their occupation earlier than other women (Almquist and Angrist, 1971; Simpson and Simpson, 1961; Vetter and Lewis, 1964), although Parker (1966) reports no relationship. There is contradictory evidence concerning the relationship between career salience and certainty of occupational choice, with Almquist and Angrist (1971), Simpson and Simpson (1961), and R. White (1971) reporting that career-salient women are more certain than other women that they will pursue their chosen occupation, while Parker (1966), M. Rosenberg (1957), and Watley (1969) found no overall difference. Richardson (1972, 1974, 1975) determined that work-oriented women are more sure of their occupational choice and engage in more occupational planning than do career-oriented women.

The evidence concerning the relationship between the prestige of occupational choice and career salience is not definitive. Some researchers report that the higher the prestige level of the career choice, the higher the career salience (Greenhaus, 1971; Richardson, 1972, 1974, 1975) and the more likely a woman is to continue to work (Pfeil, 1968; Weil, 1961), but Masih (1967) found no relationship. Comparing professional and nonprofessional choices, the Carnegie-Mellon study found no differences attributable to career salience (Angrist, 1971-1972; Angrist and Almquist, 1975). In another paper based on this study comparing women in different major fields, Angrist (cited in Astin et al., 1974, pp. 32-33) notes that while women in vocational or applied fields exhibited relatively low career commitment, a professional choice does not necessarily imply career salience.

Another popular career choice comparison is between women who choose careers typical or atypical for their sex. Terminology here differs, with researchers referring to traditional/pioneer, innovative/noninnovative, or masculine/feminine careers. Some researchers are referring to stereotypes concerning the appropriateness of occupations for each sex, while others use the same terms to refer to the actual distribution of men and women in the work force. In any case, there are differences in the reported relationship between typicality of occupational choice and career salience which can not be attributed to differences in definition and measurement. There is a definite suggestion that career-salient women are more likely to choose atypical fields (Levine, 1968, 1975; Richardson, 1972, 1974, 1975; Tangri, 1972). While the Carnegie-Mellon study reports a relationship in this direction, it was not significant (Almquist and Angrist, 1970, 1971; Angrist, 1971-1972; Angrist and Almquist, 1975), and Cowan and Moore (1971) and Hanley (1974) found no relationship between these two career dimensions. The Cowan and Moore (1971) data is instructive. Overall, 69.9 percent of their sample were career-oriented, with the remainder labelled noncareer-oriented. Concerning career choice, 84.4 percent of the choices were traditional, with a minority making pioneer choices. Of the career-oriented women, 49.5 percent chose traditional fields. One suggestive finding is that among the career-oriented, those choosing feminine fields were more likely to plan to work part time, while the pioneers more often planned to work full time.

In general, the large number of studies that have considered the relationship between specific career or major field choices and career salience support the propositions that women who choose high prestige or sex-atypical fields are more career-salient (Cook, 1967; B. Hall, 1974; Hoyt and Kennedy, 1958; Parker, 1966; Simpson and Simpson, 1961, Vetter and Lewis, 1964; R. White, 1971; Witkin, 1973). However, there are disagreements as to the attractiveness of particular fields to career- or noncareer-salient women. Also, some evidence concerning career choice and actual work patterns of adult women contradicts these general propositions (Astin, 1967; Harmon, 1967b).

For instance, teaching is a classic example of a sex-typical field classified as a lesser profession, and most researchers categorize teaching aspirations as characteristic of the noncareer-oriented group (Hoyt and Kennedy, 1958; Simpson and Simpson, 1961; Vetter and Lewis, 1964; Witkin, 1973). However, in the case of this occupational choice, the way commitment is measured is quite important. While women do tend to treat teaching as a contingent rather than a dominant role, leaving it for family reasons (Mason, 1961; Mason et al., 1959), over time, they actually are more stable in teaching than are men, because a large number of women return to teaching after their children are grown. In a major longitudinal study, Sharp (1970) found that women who choose teaching as undergraduates are highly committed to their field, with 80 to 90 percent actually practicing their occupation. Comparing arts and sciences and education majors, Schab (1967) found that most wanted to combine marriage and a career, but he predicted that the education majors would be more likely to return to work. Among education majors, the secondary trainees were more career-minded than those preparing for elementary school teaching (Schab, 1968). Teaching may be a choice of the noncontinuous work-oriented women, although the poor employment picture in this field makes it increasingly difficult for women to move in and out easily.

In summary, the possible relationships between career choice and career salience are not clear. Career-salient women may report that they chose their occupational goal earlier than other women, but they are just as likely to change their minds during the college years. They may choose occupations that are high prestige and male-dominated more often than other women, but some of their peers who choose more typical fields may also be career-salient.

A related issue has to do with the importance of work experience in determining career salience. Career choice theorists have suggested that working provides the adolescent the opportunity to act out work roles, serves as anticipatory socialization, and gives access to role models. Adolescent work experiences could influence general attitudes towards working, including career salience. Of the handful of studies that have considered this issue, two (Almquist and Angrist, 1970, 1971; Angrist and Almquist 1975; Hanley, 1974) find that career-salient women are likely to have held more jobs or more different jobs than other women, while the Parker study (1966) reports no difference.

Sex Role Ideology

Although a number of researchers either state or imply that sex role attitudes are a major differentiating factor between women who are and are not career-salient, few have measured differences in sex role ideology directly. Here, I am using the term sex role ideology to refer to women's beliefs about what behaviors are characteristic of or appropriate to a person occupying the female status.

In general, researchers who have considered the issue find that career-salient women are more feminist, egalitarian, or liberal in sex role attitudes than other women (Gaskell, 1973; Hanley, 1974;

Rossi, 1965a, 1965c; Witkin, 1973), though Steinmann (1963) reports no overall difference between women who do or do not want to work after marriage. Looking at more specific aspects of sex role ideology, we find that career-oriented women are more likely to approve of women with families working (Rossi, 1965a, 1965c; B. Turner, 1972), although most women believe a woman should put her husband's career before her own and few approve of a woman working full time when her children are small (Rossi, 1965a, 1965c). The Carnegie-Mellon study (Angrist 1971-1972; Angrist and Almquist, 1975) did discover that noncareer-oriented women are more adamant about the importance of a mother caring for her children all day, but this seems to be one norm that is slow in changing in the minds of most women. Rossi (1965a, 1965c) suggests that career-oriented women are less likely to enjoy being with children, but Westoff et al. (1961) maintain that this is not the case.

Concerning beliefs about marital roles and the division of household tasks, Angrist and Almquist (1975; Angrist, 1971-1972) found that, while the great majority of their college sample were very traditional as freshmen, the career-salient tend to discard this view. Rossi (1965a, 1965c) found that women who choose pioneer vocations want to establish egalitarian roles with men more than other women. Among adult women, Hoffman (1960) found nonworking women to have more traditional attitudes about marital role division, while Motz (1950) reported that women who work full time were the most traditional.

Although some of the evidence is contradictory, it does appear that career-salient women are more feminist in their general sex role ideology. However, there is evidence that ideology and individual behavior are not always consistent (see, for example, Parelius, 1975a, 1975b). An individual's own plans for facing the career-marriage dilemma may be better predictors of future career involvement than the norms she professes to believe.

Family Plans and Attitudes towards Family Roles

The introductory sections of this chapter suggested that the normative definition of the female role, with heavy stress on family role components, poses problems for the woman who aspires to significant career involvement. Unless family roles are redefined, the career-salient woman faces inherent conflicts of time, energy, and self-definition. Studies of adult women consistently find marital and parenthood status to be crucial "enabling" conditions that determine women's actual work patterns.

Although family role adjustments may be required, there is no necessary implication that, for women any more than for men, family and career roles are mutually exclusive. As Lopata (1966) has so ably described, the role of "housewife" has a life cycle, with periods of more and less involvement. One way women have dealt with family-career conflict is to be noncontinuously work-oriented, building a career during the "valley" periods of family obligations. For those who want to maintain continuous work involvement, further adjustments of family roles may be necessary, including considerations of family size, redefinitions of necessary family obligations, and increased role sharing.

When forced to choose, most women, regardless of career salience, expect their primary life satisfactions to come from their family rather than their career (Rossi, 1965a, 1965c; R. White, 1971). But men also expect to receive important satisfaction from their families (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971a; M. Rosenberg, 1957). The needs for intimacy and emotional contact are not met by a career in our culture. Most surveys of young women find that almost all of them want to marry and have children. For example, in the Angrist and Almquist (1975) study of women in a career-directed university, 96 percent of the sample wanted to marry and have children. In Bronzaft's (1974) recent survey, 79 percent of the female sample wanted to have a career, marriage, and children.

Although marital and parenthood aspirations may not be variable enough to consider their effect on career salience, the actual marital and parenthood status of adult women does affect their career involvement. Several studies indicate that, for women, a strong interest in a career and being single are correlated (Cook, 1967; Harmon, 1970; Rossi, 1965a, 1965c; Watley, 1969; R. White, 1971; Wolfson, 1972). While R. White (1971) found that married nurses were mostly unemployed or employed part time, this did not apply for the highly committed married women. K. White (1967) found that, among employed teachers, the married women were more strongly committed to their careers. There is the possibility of an interaction effect of romantic notions about marriage here. Angrist (1969) found that single women were more likely than married women to state that they want to concentrate on home and family.

The same was true of parenthood, with single and childless women more likely to proclaim a total commitment to family than did those with children. Rossi (1972) reports that strongly career-oriented women are less likely to have children, while Watley (1969) found no relationship between parenthood status and career plans.

Thus, we probably can predict that some career-salient college women will give up their aspirations for marriage or parenthood as a form of adjustment to career needs. This form of adjustment probably will not be apparent in their current desires, but other less drastic compromises may be considered at this early stage of life style planning.

One form of adjustment would be to postpone marriage until one's education is completed and one is launched on a career. It may be easier to maintain commitment to a life style already experienced. There is some evidence that career-salient women are more willing to marry later (Angrist, 1971-1972; Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Astin and Myint, 1971; Hanley, 1974; Harmon, 1970).

Adjustments of aspirations for parenthood may be even more crucial to determining women's career involvement. The periods in the life cycle of the homemaker that involve the most time, energy, and stress are those when child bearing and child rearing responsibilities are greatest (Lopata, 1966; Nevill and Damico, 1975). Realistic life style planning may involve considerations of family size, timing of childbirth, and child birth intervals.

Most studies that have considered these issues have been studies of adult women. It appears that career-oriented women and women who actually work want to have fewer children (Bailyn, 1970; Farley, 1970; Freedman and Coombs, 1966; Ridley, 1959; Rossi, 1965a, 1965c; Sobol, 1963; Sweet, 1973), and actually do have fewer children (Harmon, 1970; Ridley, 1959; Sobol, 1963; Sweet, 1973; Westoff et al., 1961; Wolfson, 1972). Career-oriented women and women with long work histories tend to delay child bearing (Freedman and Coombs, 1966; Harmon, 1970). While Rossman (1963) and Rapoport and Rapoport (1971a) suggest that women who complete their families over a short period are more likely to work, other studies associate longer employment duration since marriage with long birth intervals (Freedman and Coombs, 1966; Westoff et al., 1961). Finally, there is a strong relationship between age of children and working, with women with older children being more likely to work (Rossman, 1963; Sobol, 1963; Sweet, 1973; U.S. Department of Labor, 1966; Weil, 1961; Wolfson, 1972).

Among college women, the career-salient are more likely to desire to work regardless of the age of their children (Angrist, 1971-1972; Angrist and Almquist, 1975). We need more information about the specific nature of aspirations for parenthood in order to assess the realism of college-age women's career plans.

Another potential line of inquiry that has not been investigated in studies of college-age women is their expectations about the allocation of marital responsibilities. Support of an egalitarian division of labor in the family would seem to facilitate the career involvement of the wife. Studies of working women support this contention in that there is usually more role sharing in families where the wife works (Blood and Hamblin, 1958; Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Finkelman, 1966; Geiken, 1964; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971a; Weil, 1961). Safilios-Rothschild (1970a) reports that wives who are highly committed to their career are more dominant in family decision making than those who are less committed. On the other hand, Poloma and Garland (1971) found that, in many dual-career marriages, there is no role sharing, so that the wife ends up with at least two jobs.

Another area that needs consideration in a more systematic way is a young women's degree of awareness of the potential conflicts between home and career responsibilities. M. Freedman (1967) reports that career-oriented women feel more conflict. Watley (1969) asked adult women with different career-family goals to outline the major problems they faced in making their plans. Those who chose to have marriage or a career only cited no problems. Those who preferred a deferred career felt pulled in several directions, while those who were uncertain about their plans were most concerned with their difficulty in finding a husband. In the same study, the most often cited problem due to being female was discrimination, with those planning immediate careers and those who were uncertain about their plans most likely to see this as a disadvantage. The fact that the apparent conflict between home and career leads to the dampening of career aspirations is suggested by the M. Freedman (1967) data, where one-half of the career-oriented women felt they would have to interrupt their career for family obligations. Farmer and Bohn's (1970) interesting experimental work implies that if home-career conflict is reduced, career interests go up among women.

Perhaps the most significant finding in the review of the literature on the relationships between career salience and family plans is the little information available about the family role aspirations of college women. While studies of adult women indicate that marital and parenthood status and the way in which family roles are enacted have significant effects on whether women work, little attention has focussed on how young women plan to deal with these contingencies.

Personality and Self-Concept

More research attention has focussed on the personality attributes and self concepts of women with varying degrees of career salience than on any other area reviewed here. This focus is due to the psychological bent of much of the literature and the concern that career salience may be evidence of personal maladjustment.

Personality refers to the complex of characteristics that distinguishes an individual, including her behavioral and emotional tendencies and the organization of her character traits, attitudes, and habits. Personality is an intraindividual term, but it is exhibited through characteristic ways of behaving over a range of situations. Thus, one's personality is socially born and displayed in social interaction. A behavioral definition of personality suggests that "personality is the totality of the behavior of an individual with a given tendency system, interacting with a sequence of situations" (Yinger, 1965, p. 141).

The self-concept is the central unit of one's character, consisting of the composite of thoughts and feelings that constitute a person's awareness of her individual existence, her concept of who or what she is. Rogers (1951) defines the phenomenological or conscious self as follows:

> The self-concept or self-structure may be thought of as an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects; and goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive or negative valence. (p. 136)

Most self theories hold that an individual's self-concept is learned, is a product of interpersonal experience, and is affected by the reflected appraisals of others (see for example, Cooley, 1902; Durkheim, 1951, 1964; Goffman, 1959, 1961; G. Mead, 1934; Miyamoto and Dornbusch, 1956; Riesman, 1950; Sarbin, 1952; Sherif and Sherif, 1969; Sullivan, 1965; P. Symonds, 1951; Wylie, 1961).

The symbolic interactionist position holds that the self-concept is a crucial attribute to measure in understanding human behavior because the organization and direction of behavior is supplied by the individual's attitudes towards herself. A person organizes her behavior to fit concepts of self, of other actors in the situation, and of the situation in which action takes place (McPartland et al., 1961).

Here, I will consider together those studies which measure the self-concept of women and those that consider more general personality structure using standard personality inventories. Both types of measures concern relatively enduring character traits, modes of behaving, and personal identities exhibited over a wide range of situations. The studies cited use a wide variety of measurement procedures and it is not possible to critique individual measures and theories here. Therefore, this review focusses on patterns of findings concerning the relationship between career salience and personality which seem to hold regardless of measurement procedure.

Much of the support for the deviance explanation of career salience rests on personality and self-concept data. The concern is that women who value a career are personally maladjusted, with maladjustment defined as the possession of a negative self-concept or socially undesirable traits and the exhibition of "masculine" personality qualities. Lewis (1965) suggests two explanations of why one might expect career-salient women to be more maladjusted. The woman who wants to expand the traditional female role has to overcome many cultural roadblocks, and this effort may take its toll in personal adjustment. Or, career-orientation in women may grow out of personal dissatisfaction, with a career becoming an outlet for frustration in other roles.

The evidence concerning the possibility of a relationship between career salience and personal maladjustment is mixed. It is difficult to equate studies that variously define adjustment as scores on maladjustment scales or standardized psychiatric inventories, as real-ideal self-concept discrepancies, as stress symptoms, or as self ratings of happiness. Even if one makes such an equation, the findings are not definitive: no difference related to career salience (Angrist and

Almquist, 1975; Eyde, 1962; Stewart and Winter, 1974); noncareer-oriented are more well adjusted (Lewis, 1965, 1968; Vetter and Lewis, 1964); career-oriented are more well-adjusted (Cowan and Moore, 1971); relationship depends on various other characteristics of the women studied (E. Ellis, 1952; Fogarty et al., 1971); and differential relationships depending on the type of adjustment studied (M. Freedman, 1967; Hoyt and Kennedy, 1958; Masih, 1967).

I would like to consider two viewpoints in detail, for the light they shed on the possible interpretations of this rather confusing evidence. Focussing on the self-concept discrepancy issue, Richardson (1972, 1975) measured self, homemaker, career woman, and ideal woman concepts, considering the intervening effects of self esteem and degree of role differentiation between homemaker and career concepts. Those college seniors showing high self-homemaker congruence were not career-oriented, but high self-career woman congruence did not necessarily predict a strong career-orientation. This relationship was stronger for those with high self-esteem and those who differentiated clearly between homemaker and career role descriptions. Richardson suggests that the development of an integrated personality which incorporates career role aspirations consistent with self and role perceptions is not complete in the senior year of college. If one deviates from the traditional female role, the developmental process may be more difficult and prolonged. Also, it may be that the career role concept is less stable in our culture than that of homemaker.

Theodore (1971) suggests that the career discontinuity common for working women has negative implications for personality integration.

An erratic and inconsistent work pattern may result in a great degree of emotional instability, as each time one enters the occupational world, one is confronted anew with the problem of incorporating new identities into the self-concept. This interpretation implies that it is women's career patterns that are "maladjusted", rather than the women who enact them.

Since standards for adjustment are subjective, I believe it is more fruitful to look at more specific personality dimensions that might differentiate among women with varying degrees of career salience. Because of the concern with deviation from cultural norms, much attention has focussed on whether career-salient women are more "masculine" in personality than other women. The evidence from several studies that use standardized masculinity-femininity scales is mixed. Cowan and Moore (1971), Masih (1967), and Witkin (1973) report no difference attributable to career-orientation, while Hanley (1974) and Zissis (1962) found that career-salient women are more masculine. Gaskell (1973) discovered no relationship between attitudes about femininity and career-involvement aspirations. Rand (1968) used a series of different types of masculinity-femininity measures and found that career-oriented women scored higher on 24 of the 25 masculine items. However, they also scored higher than homemaking-oriented women in four of six feminine areas, including measures of feminine competencies, potentialities, and achievement in the performing arts. The homemaking-oriented women were higher only on measures of feminine personality attributes and social skills. It would appear that the important difference is that career-salient women view themselves as generally competent in a variety of areas, regardless of whether their interests are stereotyped as masculine or feminine.

Other studies that simply report individual attributes associated with career salience shed further light on the pattern of sex stereotyped characteristics and the evaluative tone[6] of attributes that may differentiate women with different degrees of interest in a career. Descriptions of women who are relatively strongly career-oriented highlight personality attributes that are positive in tone and masculine in stereotype. Exemplary attributes in this category include self confidence, self-assertion, ambition, productivity, competence, and independence (Birnbaum, 1971; Cook, 1967; M. Freedman, 1967; Gaskell, 1973; Greenhaus, 1971, 1973; Gysbers et al., 1968; Hanley, 1974; Lewis, 1965; Rossi, 1965a, 1965c; Veres, 1974; Witkin, 1973). Most studies also report that career-salient women are more competitive, although Counselman (1971) found that noncareer-oriented women were more competitive. There is suggestive evidence that the type of competition may explain this inconsistency, with career-oriented women being more occupationally competitive, while homemaking-oriented women appear competitive in social areas (Rossi, 1965a, 1965c; R. Turner, 1964b).

---

[6] Sex stereotype refers to consensual beliefs about the differing characteristics of adult men and women in American society (Rosenkrantz et al., 1968). Evaluative tone is defined as what is considered by most people as a socially desirable or undesirable characteristic for an adult member of American society. Attributes reported in the studies cited were categorized along these two dimensions using the codebook developed for the self-concept measures used in this study and outlined in Appendix 2.

Other information about the self-concepts or personality attributes of women who are strongly career-salient is validated by only single studies. The list includes a wide array of socially desirable and undesirable, masculine and feminine qualities (see Birnbaum, 1971; Counselman, 1971; M. Freedman, 1967; Gysbers et al., 1968; Helson, 1967; Lewis, 1965).

Descriptions of noncareer-oriented women are much more homogeneous and decidedly feminine. They are found to have the positive qualities of being loving, nurturant, social, affiliative, and friendly (Birnbaum, 1971; Gysbers et al., 1968; Oliver, 1974; Rossi, 1965a, 1965c; Sedney and Turner, 1975). On the negative side, they are compliant, dependent, need security, have low self esteem, and hold negative self-evaluations of competence (Birnbaum, 1971; Cook, 1967; Counselman, 1971; Gysbers et al., 1968; Rossi, 1965a, 1965c).

Overall, the evidence based on personality inventory assessment and self-evaluation suggests that career salience is associated with more socially desirable individual attributes than is a noncareer-orientation. The personality profiles of career-oriented women show a stress on "masculine" attributes related to individual achievement, with some evidence that they may be lacking in social skills and may feel socially isolated.

The Influence of Significant Others on Career Salience

The Roles of a Significant Other

Self-conceptions and attitudes towards objects, such as education and a career, are products of social experience. The opinions and behavior of a significant other, defined by Woelfel (1967) as a person who exerts an important influence over the attitudes of an individual, can affect a woman's ability to conceive of herself as a career woman and her attitudes towards the relative importance of a career in her life plans.

In Woelfel's formulation (1967; Woelfel and Haller, 1971), a significant other may be a model, someone to emulate and imitate; or a definer, someone from whom to gain information; or both. A model influences an individual's attitudes by being observed; a definer exerts influence by means of symbolic communication. Serving as a model and/or a definer of the individual's self and/or of an object (e.g., educational attainment, women's ability to have a career and a family), a significant other can provide one of the following types of support: 1) Social-emotional or expressive support, involving affective importance and an indication of a liking for and a belief in the individual's capabilities; 2) instrumental support, involving giving help or guidelines for the achievement of goals; and 3) multi-functional support, involving a combination of the other two types. (Rhile, 1968).

The degree of influence exerted by a potential significant other is affected by the types of support offered by that individual and the degree to which the influenced person is willing to accept information from him or her. Rhile (1968) views multifunctional support as the most powerful, followed by instrumental support of the role model variety, then of the advice variety, and finally, by social-emotional support. Woelfel (1967) suggests that an individual is more likely to be influenced by a person towards whom she feels positive affect; who has high credibility, defined as competence and lack of bias in judging an object or one's self; and whose communications are congruent. An important aspect of congruence is the fit between a significant other's communications as a model (behavior) and as a definer (advice).

Significant others also may differ according to the specificity or diffuseness of their interest in and areas of influence over an individual (Kemper, 1966). Thus, Denzin (1966) differentiates between role-specific significant others, people who influence self and object conceptions in relation to one role, e.g., as a student; and orientational significant others, people who influence a broad range of role-conceptions, whose evaluation of the subject as a person is important.

Finally, Merton (1957) distinguishes between normative and comparative reference groups. Normative reference groups set norms and values, expect compliance, and sanction lack of compliance (Kemper, 1968). Comparative reference groups, or what Kemper (1968) calls an audience, are groups for whom an actor performs in order to gain recognition and that provide feedback as to the adequacy of his performance. Reed (1966) suggests that normative groups affect primary norms, which are internalized, while comparative groups affect secondary norms, to the extent that their approval is valued. As in the case of types of support, individuals who serve both normative and audience functions increase their importance as significant others.

These conceptualizations of the roles of significant others and the types of support provided by them will be used to analyze the available literature on the effects of parents, teachers, and male peers on career salience among college women. I would suggest that because of their own educational and career attainment, these groups have differential resources as models and definers that may explicate their influence on the career plans of the women with whom they interact. The role of parents as significant others is emphasized, because it is the family background of the sample studied here that most clearly differentiates them from other study samples.

Family Background and Career Salience

There is very little research information available concerning how parents, as models and definers, affect their daughter's attitudes towards a career. The available data is focussed on the effects of three aspects of parents' roles as models: identification with or closeness to parents, family socioeconomic status, and mother's work experience. No one has considered the role of parents as models of marital role performance. There are only a handful of studies that have considered the effects of parents as definers. Parents provide advice to their daughters and direct their energies towards or away from career interests through explicit sex role training. Little attention has been paid to the attitudes of parents or differential socialization practices that might explain the roots of career salience in women. Based on what we know about the correlates of career salience, I would expect career salience to be fostered in families that emphasize individual achievement, high educational attainment, and egalitarian sex role attitudes.

Because of these research gaps, the review of the literature concerning sources of parental influence draws on studies not directly concerned with career salience among women, and, thus, the hypotheses based on this review are quite speculative. Throughout the review, I will describe briefly the expected differentiating effect of socio-economic status on individual parental attributes and values. Because the sample of interest represents a relatively narrow "slice of social class," parental support structures typical for working-class women as a group also are of interest.

Identification and sex role socialization. I have argued that career salience in women requires the development of different sex role conceptions than those considered normative in our culture. Most theories of the process of sex role socialization indicate that basic sex role conceptions are learned early in life through identification with parents. Kagan (1964, p. 146) defines identification as ". . . a belief that some of the attributes of a model belong to the self." He cites three conditions for the establishment of strong identification patterns: 1) the model must be perceived as nurturant to the child; 2) the model must be perceived as being in command of desired goals, especially power, love from others, and task competence in areas the child regards as important; and 3) the child must perceive some objective bases of similarity in external attributes or psychological properties between herself and the model.

This emphasis on trait similarity as a basis for identification is questioned in other formulations. Winch (1962) distinguishes among similar identification, in which the child tries to fashion her behavior after that of the parent; reciprocal identification, in which the child tries to model behavior not to copy, but to complement a parent's behavior; and negative identification, in which the child strives to be opposite to her parents. M. Johnson (1963) defines identification as felt solidarity with a parent, which does not require trait similarity.

Most theorists and research evidence agree that children learn their sex role, defined by D. Brown (1958, p. 232) as "the behavior that is socially defined and expected of that person because of his or her status as male or female," through identification with the like-sex parent (see, for example, Gray and Klaus, 1956; Kagan, 1964; Kagan and Lemkin, 1960; Lynn, 1959, 1962). Females initially have an easier time developing a sex role identity because they can continue the original identification of all children with the mother and because they can directly observe and copy their mother's behavior, while males have less opportunity to observe the crucial occupational aspects of the male role and must identify with a cultural stereotype (Chodorow, 1971; Lynn, 1959, 1962). On the other hand, Douvan (1960) points out that there is no strong motive force equivalent to castration anxiety operating for females, which may lead to a less clear and definite identification with the like-sex parent for women. Also, females soon learn that status and power, part of their identification motivation, are associated with the male role (Bronfenbrenner, 1960; Kagan, 1958, Lynn, 1959, 1962).

Based on findings that fathers seem to differentiate their treatment of children by sex more than do mothers, Heilbrun (1968), M. Johnson (1963), and Rosenberg and Sutton-Smith (1968) suggest that fathers play a more critical role in determining the sex role preferences of children of either sex than do mothers. M. Johnson (1963) asserts that both males and females develop appropriate sex role orientations through identification with the father, which, in the case of females, involves internalizing a reciprocal role relationship with the father.

Mussen and Rutherford's (1963) study suggests a basis for reconciliation of these apparently divergent views of the necessary identification process for the development of normative sex role behavior. In a study of first graders, they found that a mother's self-acceptance and a father's encouragement of sex-typed game behavior were both significantly related to femininity in girls. This suggests that a mother is potentially a more potent model, while a father may be the crucial definer of sex-role appropriate behavior.

Regardless of the theories of identification formation accepted, the strength of a child's identification with traditional sex role norms can not be predicted only on the basis of the strength of identification with a particular parent. One also must measure the degree to which the parent exhibits sex-typed behavior and the pattern of rewards issued by each parent, that is, whether the child is rewarded for sex-typed behavior and punished for deviant sex role behavior (Kagan, 1964). Thus, while Eirich-Cohen (1972) reports that adult women who identify with their fathers have more masculine sex role identities, the same is true for women who identify with an active, dominant mother. She suggests that an individual may identify with the opposite-sex aspect of a parent's personality. This contention helps to explain M. Johnson's (1963) findings on the effects of solidarity with the father on women's sex role identity. The most expressive, or feminine girls in her sample were those who described their father as doting, protective, or equally expressive. The most instrumental, or masculine girls were those whose fathers were basically absent, or uninvolved in their daughter's socialization, and those whose fathers were involved but unexpressive towards their daughter.

Most of the researchers who have considered the relationship between parental identification or closeness to parents and career salience in daughters have not measured the sex-role appropriateness of the parental model. Some researchers have used measures that purport to indicate identification, while others have considered the overall feeling of warmth versus tension, degree of closeness, or positive versus negative affect apparent in the daughter-parent relationship. Regardless of the particular measure used, the findings are not definitive.

Concerning degree of identification with or closeness to one's mother, three studies report no difference related to the daughter's degree of career salience (Almquist and Angrist, 1970; Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Nuzum, 1970; Stein, 1973). Rossi (1965a) reports that college women with high career aspirations have tense relationships with their mothers, while two studies of adult women report more identification with and closeness to the mother among women whose primary orientation is towards homemaking rather than a career (Fogarty et al., 1971; Nagely, 1971).

Identification with one's father also does not seem to explain differences in career salience. Again, three studies report no differences in degree of identification with or closeness to one's father and career salience (Almquist and Angrist, 1970; Angrist and Almquist, 1975; R. Johnson, 1970; Nuzum, 1970). Fogarty et al. (1971) found more father identification among career-oriented women, while Rossi (1965a) reports that women with high career aspirations are closer to their fathers than other women.

The one study (Heilbrun, 1969) that considers the masculinity/femininity of the parental model in conjunction with degree of identification found higher career interests among women with masculine mothers or feminine fathers. The most rejection of career interests occurred among women with feminine mothers. This conflicts somewhat with Nuzum's (1970) finding that homemaking-oriented women describe their fathers as more expressive than do career-oriented women. She also found no differences in the nature of the descriptions of mothers in the two groups.

Other researchers have focussed on the degree of warmth of relationships with both parents as an explanation of career salience, rather than the issue of differential sex-identification. In these cases, we see a more consistent pattern suggesting that career-salient women feel less close to, less accepted by their parents (N. Carlson, 1970; Fogarty et al., 1971; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971a; B. White, 1959). Angrist and Almquist (1975) found an insignificant tendency for "careerists" to view their relationship with both parents negatively. While Rapoport and Rapoport (1971b) found tense family relationships to be typical of the background of women in dual career marriages, they note that these women usually received some parental support, the most typical pattern being more tension in their relationships with their mothers and more warmth in their relationships with their fathers. Rossi (1965a) notes a tendency for homemaking-oriented women to have had more intense, extensive relationships with all family members in their childhoods than did career-oriented women.

This research suggests that the warmth or closeness of a woman's relationship with her parents may be an important predictor of career salience. Tension in the relationship with one's mother may be a particularly important source of career motivation, though such tension need not imply turning to one's father as a source of identification.

Still, it is important to consider the degree to which parents exhibit sex-typed behavior. Identification with one or the other parent alone tells us little about the nature of the sex role standards that a woman may have internalized.

Occupational status and educational attainment. One important aspect of parents' roles as models of career involvement should be their own success in the occupational and educational arenas. High status parents may be more likely to be involved in a true "career", an occupation requiring a sense of personal involvement and having a developmental quality. They can provide direct evidence of the rewards gained through investment of time and energy in education and work. Dyer (1964, p. 90) notes the effects of parental occupational status on attitudes towards work: "For the blue-collar family, the job is much more a source of livelihood, while for the white-collar family, the job is a source of prestige satisfaction, a source of gratification, and a more central life 'theme' for the family."

There is more interpenetration of family and work roles in middle-class than in working-class families (Rainwater, Coleman, and Handel, 1959; Komarovsky, 1967). Reading descriptions of working-class families, one gets more of an impression of "home as haven", a place where work pressures are forgotten and work is not discussed. Daughters in such families may receive little direct information about what work is like or how their father feels about it. However, by observing the effects of their father's work on the quality of family life, they are made more aware of the debilitating consequences of a lack of education and occupational skills than are their more advantaged peers. Working-class parents may serve as potent negative models for their daughters. In fact, there is evidence that working-class parents who are interested in "getting ahead" encourage their children to view them as negative models of educational and occupational performance (Dyer, 1958; Guttmacher, 1971; Kahl, 1953).

I have suggested that women in general approach career planning with a contingency orientation. It seems plausible to suggest that women from working-class backgrounds should have a stronger contingency orientation than middle-class women.[7] Their lives have probably been less predictable than those of their middle-class sisters. They are used to and more accepting of life's hazards (see Rainwater, Coleman, and Handel, 1959). However, while this realistic attitude may encourage working-class women to obtain job skills "just in case", it does not necessarily predispose them to choose a career-oriented life style as their ideal.

The occupational status and educational attainment of parents also affect their resources as significant others. Identification with high status parents may be strengthened by their child's perception that they have relatively greater social power and competence. Their own educational and career experience should increase their ability to provide instrumental or multifunctional support for their daughter's aspirations. Working-class women may be less likely to identify with their parents because of their lack of social power. While working-class parents may not be able to serve as positive models of educational and occupational attainment, they may try to serve as definers of the importance of these goals. Parental wish-fulfillment, parents passing on their status longings to their children, is an important predictor of high educational aspirations among working-class youth (Guttmacher, 1971; Kahl, 1953), and the same effects may occur in the case of attitudes towards a career. The problem is that since lower status parents can not serve as positive models, and, in their role as definers, can provide social-emotional but little instrumental support, their influence as significant others may be diluted.

---

[7] There is some suggestive evidence that contingency planning is affected by social class (Ginzberg and Yohalem, 1966; Lefton et al., 1962; Rossi, 1972).

There is quite a bit of evidence that working-class youth, especially those who are upwardly mobile, identify less with and feel less close to their parents than do more advantaged youth (Douvan and Kaye, 1962; Dynes et al., 1956; Ellis and Lane, 1963; McKinley, 1964; E. T. Peterson, 1961; Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957; T. Smith 1964). In a study of "outstanding" career women, E. Ellis (1952) found that those who had been intergenerationally mobile were significantly more likely to report rejection by their parents, less attachment to their parents, and conflict with their parents in adulthood than were the nonmobile career women. Thus, what Merton (1957) called the "dis-associative consequences" of social mobility may lead upwardly mobile working-class women to identify less with their parents and feel less close to them. Given that their parents are not positive models of a career-salient life style and given the previously cited evidence that closeness to parents seems to serve as a conservative force moving women away from career interests, this disassociative tendency may be a particularly important source of career motivation among less advantaged women. Also, as K. White (1967) notes:

> . . . The young woman who has been socially mobile and who can identify her professional position as a primary symbol of her social mobility will become more committed to her profession than the young woman who cannot identify her profession as a symbol of social mobility. (p. 650)

This discussion of the potential modes through which parental socioeconomic status might directly affect career salience in daughters suggests that there are different, but potentially important pressures towards career salience across the whole socioeconomic spectrum. This view helps to explain the fact that a number of researchers report no significant difference in career salience related to parental socioeconomic status whether measured as both parents' education (Siegel and Curtis, 1963), mother's education (Almquist and Angrist, 1970, 1971; Stein, 1973), father's occupational status (Almquist and Angrist, 1971; Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Siegel and Curtis, 1963; B. Turner, 1972), or composite measures of education, occupation, and income (Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Simpson and Simpson, 1961; R. Turner, 1964b). Single studies report a positive relationship between higher career salience and high educational attainment by both parents (Gysbers et al., 1968), high mother's education (Astin, 1969), high father's occupational status (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971a), and high socioeconomic status represented by both education and occupation (Astin, 1968a). On the other hand, several studies that use father's occupational status as their measure, find that low status fathers, specifically those involved in manual work, have strongly career-salient daughters (Kinnane and Bannon, 1964; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1965, 1971b; K. White, 1967).

Two additional studies suggest that the problem may be that most researchers have looked only for linear relationships between socioeconomic status and career salience. In a study of a cross-section of women attending a public university, Witkin (1973) found a curvilinear relationship between parents' education and income and the strength of daughters' career aspirations. Women from low income, low education families and daughters from high income, high education families were both significantly more career-oriented than women from middle-income, high school-educated families. Birnbaum's (1971) study of work-marriage patterns among middle-aged women uncovered a somewhat similar pattern. Using a composite measure, she found that the typical homemaker was brought up in a middle-class family, married professionals came from upper-middle class families, and single professionals most typically were raised in lower-class families.

No one has considered the effect of cross-class pressures such as differential social class identification, inconsistency among a father's status attributes, downward mobility compared to the grandparent generation, or maternal status dominance on career salience among daughters. Such factors might be particularly important in understanding career salience among women from working-class families. For example, Watson and Barth (1964) found that 78 percent of working-class families have a difference of at least one occupational status level between spouses, with the wife apt to hold the position with greater occupational prestige. Miller and Riesman (1961b) suggest that upwardly mobile individuals from working-class origins are likely to have experienced middle-class cross pressures such as those listed above. There is quite a bit of evidence that maternal status dominance is an important predictor of high educational aspirations among working-class youth (Z. Blau, 1972; Ellis and Lane, 1963, Ginn, 1968; Guttmacher, 1971; Kraus, 1964; Strodtbeck, 1958; R. Turner, 1964c).

As Krauss (1964) suggests:

> The working-class mother whose occupational status is higher than her husband's is likely to come into contact with middle-class persons and middle-class values. If her husband's status seems unlikely to improve, she may attempt to realize her aspirations through her children by encouraging them to develop middle-class interests and objectives. (p. 869)

While "middle-class objectives" may include high educational aspirations, career commitment among women does not appear to be a middle-class role preference. However, since educational aspirations seem to be strongly correlated to career salience, it seems that cross-class pressures within the family should be a fruitful area to study to increase our understanding of the effects of socioeconomic status on career salience.

In general, it appears that parental socioeconomic status has no definitive direct effects on career salience. More specific aspects of parental behavior and attitudes as models and definers, which themselves may be influenced by socioeconomic status, may be better predictors of which women will be career-salient.

Mother's work patterns. Based on the theory that people are most likely to identify with the like-sex parent and to imitate that parent's behavior, many researchers have considered the effect of mothers' work histories on their daughters' attitudes towards careers. A mother who herself works outside the home serves as a very different model of sex role performance than one who does not. Her daughter has firsthand experience on which to base an assessment of whether it is possible to combine family and work responsibilities and how to best go about doing so. The available evidence generally supports the hypothesis of a direct modelling effect. Whether mothers' work patterns are operationally defined as current employment, having ever worked, working full time, or the total number of years worked, most studies find a positive correlation between having a working mother and career salience or wanting to work among daughters (Almquist and Angrist, 1970, 1971; Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Bruce, 1974; Conaway and Niple, 1966; Cook, 1967; Hanley, 1974; Hartley, 1960b; Rossi, 1965a; Stein, 1973; Veres, 1974; K. White, 1967). Some studies of the actual work patterns of adult women also report a positive relationship between a woman's work involvement and her mother's work history (Astin, 1967, 1969; Bailyn, 1970). On the other hand, Fogarty et al. (1971) found no relationship between having a working mother and the work patterns of adult women, and Birnbaum (1971) found that, while married professional women tended to have working mothers, both homemakers and single professionals typically came from families where the mother did not work outside the home. B. Turner (1972) also found no relationship between the amount mothers worked during the subjects' childhood and the preferred work involvement of college women.

Although the bulk of the evidence suggests that having a working mother predisposes women to have positive attitudes towards a career, these discrepant studies are important because their samples included more working-class women than is true of those that report a positive relationship. Viewing mothers purely as models of work involvement, working-class women, along with daughters of highly-educated mothers, should be more likely to want to have a career as they are more likely to have had a working mother (Gillette, 1961; Haavio - Mannila, 1967; McKinley, 1964; Regan, 1972; Stoltz, 1960).

However, it is possible that a mother's communications to her daughter in her roles as model and definer may not be congruent. How a mother feels about her work or about working in general, or how she feels about her homemaking roles, may affect the degree to which her daughter chooses to imitate her actual behavior. Those studies that have considered the relative effects of maternal employment status and maternal attitudes towards work consistently report that a mother's expressing positive attitudes towards working has a much greater impact on her daughter's career salience or preference for combining marriage and a career than does a mother's actual employment history (G. Baruch, 1972; Erickson and Nordin, 1974; Fogarty et al., 1971; Hartley, 1960b; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971a, 1971b; Siegel and Curtis, 1963). Two studies also report negative feelings about the role of the homemaker among mothers of more highly career-salient women (Erickson and Nordin, 1974; Fogarty et al., 1971). Thus, these data suggest that career salience may be strongest among women whose mothers worked and enjoyed working and those whose mothers did not work but felt frustrated as housewives. Although identification theory suggests that what one does has a more potent influence than what one says, if the communications from one significant other are not congruent, this inconsistency may dilute her influence as a model.

Returning to the suggestion that the work patterns of the mother may have less influence on career salience among working-class women, it may be that working-class mothers are more likely than higher status women to express negative feelings about working. The money earned by employed working-class mothers is more necessary for family support, although inflation is making two incomes a necessity for middle-income families as well. Working-class mothers also are more likely to hold dead-end, low skill jobs that may not allow opportunities for personal fulfillment. Thus, employed mothers in working-class families may convey the message to their daughters that they work out of necessity, not choice, and that work is not an enjoyable enterprise.

There is some evidence that working-class mothers are more likely than middle-class women to emphasize extrinsic reasons for working and that the fact that they work does not change their definition of their primary roles as being those of wife and mother (Komarovsky, 1967; E. T. Peterson, 1961; Rainwater, Coleman, and Handel, 1959). Douvan (1963) describes the working-class mother who works full-time as follows:

> The mother who works because of serious economic need is not necessarily one whose psychological make-up prepares her for the dual roles of homemaker and worker. She may feel herself taxed by the demands of a life complication which she did not choose and does not feel up to. Sheer economic deprivation adds a further burden of concern, and in many cases we might expect to find such women both harried and resentful or passively resigned to an unsatisfying and burdensome life situation. (pp. 159-160)

Fogarty et al. (1971) note that college-educated adult women from low status family backgrounds are most likely to follow a continuous work pattern, which they suggest is due to the modelling effects of their own working mothers. However, they also are likely to be the "conflicted" workers, who work although they have no ideological commitment to women having careers or do not obtain personal satisfaction from their work. While any woman may receive a double message from her mother about the place of employment in the female role, this confusion may be greatest for working-class women.

Few studies have considered the effects of the specific nature of the mother's work on her daughter's attitudes towards having a career. Among a group of women with doctorates, Astin (1969) found that the majority of the employed mothers were engaged in professional or managerial work. Almquist and Angrist (1970, 1971) found that, although few of the mothers in their relatively high status sample were employed in male-dominated occupations, a higher proportion of mothers of strongly career-salient women held such positions. This is an area that needs further exploration.

Other areas where little is known include the differentiating effect of fathers' attitudes towards their wives' employment and daughters' own attitudes towards their working mothers. Erickson and Nordin (1974) report a slight tendency for daughters of employed mothers to be more career-salient if their fathers felt positive about their wives' working, but the influence of the fathers' attitudes was not as strong as that of the mothers' own attitudes. Fogarty et al. (1971) found no difference in career salience among adult women related to their self reports about how they felt as children about their mothers' employment. However, they suggest that current reports may be rationalizations of women's own work patterns more than accurate recollections of how they felt in the past.

In summary, it appears that strong career salience may be a product of modelling oneself after a working mother. The reasons a mother works and how she feels about working or not working may be important intervening factors that determine whether her daughter will imitate her behavior.

Parental marital role division. I could find no studies that consider the effects of parents as models of marital role performance on their daughter's attitudes towards a career. This gap in the literature probably is due to the assumption that career attitudes only are products of exposure to work role models. I have suggested that placing priority on a career involves a major redefinition of the female role with implications for the wife and mother components of that role as well as the work components. Earlier in this chapter, I reviewed evidence that suggests that there is more family role sharing in families where the wife works and suggested that egalitarian expectations for marital roles may be a component of career salience in women.

Just as having a working mother as a role model may facilitate women's ability to see themselves involved in a career, parents who share marital roles could serve as models of family role performance that facilitates career involvement. I would expect women who were brought up in families where decision making was shared, and where fathers participated in the traditional female tasks of child rearing and housekeeping to be more able to incorporate a career into their future plans.

In this respect, women from middle-class families should have an "advantage" in that there appears to be less segregation of roles along traditional lines in middle-class than in working- or lower-class families (Gans, 1962; Haavio-Mannila, 1967; Komarovsky, 1967; Miller and Riesman, 1961b; Rainwater, Coleman, and Handel, 1959). While Rainwater and Handel (1964) forecasted the decline of highly segregated conjugal roles in some "modern" working-class families, recent studies of such families still highlight the lack of real communication, the different worlds in which working-class husbands and wives live (LeMasters, 1975; Rubin, 1976). Parental roles also seem more sharply differentiated in working-class families, with the mother viewed as the supportive parent and the father seen as the source of constraint or as having no parenting role at all (Bronson et al., 1959; Kohn, 1964a; Kohn and Carroll, 1960).

As for authority over decision making, norms and actual behavior do not seem to coincide, especially in working-class families. The norm in such families seems to be that "the man wears the pants," but the reality seems to be that the wife has more authority in working-class families than in middle-class families (Bloode and Wolfe, 1960; Gans, 1962; McKinley, 1964; Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957). The husband's relative degree of success and authority in the work world, and the degree to which his wife can compete with him in the role of economic provider, seem to be mirrored in authority patterns within the home.

The more segregated roles in working-class families are reflected in the marital role expectations of adolescents. Dunn (1960) reported that adolescents from less advantaged families held more traditional expectations than more advantaged youth concerning responsibilities for child care, involvement in education, and financial support, though there were no differences in preferred homemaking, social participation, or authority role patterns related to family socioeconomic background. In a more recent study, Sterrett and Bollman (1970) also found more egalitarian expectations of marital roles among adolescents from higher status families.

Parental emphasis on individual achievement. The literature on socioeconomic status differences in socialization practices highlights the concern with obedience, respectability, and conformity to externally imposed standards in the working class, compared to the emphasis on developing internal standards and self-direction combined with high standards for performance in the middle class (Gans, 1962; Kohn, 1959, 1964a; McKinley, 1964; Miller and Riesman, 1961b; Pearlin and Kohn, 1966). Working-class parents seem to be more protective and restrictive, especially towards their daughters (Kagan and Moss, 1962; Rainwater, Coleman, and Handel, 1959). Kagan and Moss (1962) note that more highly educated mothers are more critical and acceleratory towards their daughters.

These differential socialization practices seem to be mirrored in the achievement values of adolescents and adults, as individuals with a greater need for achievement tend to come from higher status families (Kagan and Moss, 1962; Lueptow, 1975). However, such relationships are generally weaker for women than for men. Horner (1970) has suggested that the strength of the motive to avoid success is a better predictor of achievement behavior in women than is the need for achievement, and has noted less avoidance of success among lower- and lower-middle-class women than among women from higher status backgrounds.

I could find only three studies that consider the relationship between such parental socialization emphases and career expectations or work involvement of women. Among a small sample of freshmen in college, B. Turner (1972) found that those who expected to be involved in a career in the future were significantly more likely than those who expected little career involvement to report that their parents emphasized trying hard to succeed. There also was an insignificant tendency for those with high career expectations to report less emphasis by their parents on obedience, self-control, and good manners, or what Turner describes as the qualities of a "good" girl. In a survey of adult female college graduates, Kriger (1972) found a significant tendency for homemakers to report that their parents were overprotective or restrictive, while the working women described their parents as permissive, casual, or accepting. However, she found no relationship between degree of parental control and need for achievement scores. Considering the effects of parents as models, Birnbaum (1971) discovered that although homemakers and married professional women had parents with equivalent, and relatively high educational attainment, the professionals were significantly more likely to report that their fathers had strong intellectual interests.

Parents' educational aspirations and values. The consistent evidence of a strong relationship between educational aspirations and degree of career salience suggests that one way parents may influence a woman's degree of interest in a career is through encouraging and supporting her educational aspirations. There is ample evidence that parental stress on education is positively related to children's educational aspirations (see for example, Bell, 1963; Bordua, 1960; R. Ellis and Lane, 1963; Dansereau, 1964; Herriott, 1963; Kahl, 1953; Kandel and Lesser, 1970; Sandis, 1970; Sewell et al., 1969, 1970; Simpson, 1962; Tomeh, 1968). Only two studies of college women, both of which have very small samples, consider whether there is a relationship between parents' educational aspirations for their daughter and career salience. A. Siegel and Curtis (1963) found no relationship between parents' attitudes towards the importance of education and their daughter's work-orientation, while B. Turner (1972) reports an insignificant tendency for women with high career involvement expectations to report relatively low parental aspirations, and a significant tendency for such women to attribute less negative reaction from their fathers to the possibility of their dropping out of college than do women with lower career expectations.

In the mid-1960's, Jaffe and Adams (1964) asserted that the social desirability of a college education had become an almost universally accepted cultural value. While differences in parental aspirations for their children may have narrowed, we still see negative relationships between socioeconomic status and parents' stress on education (Jencks et al., 1972; Sewell et al., 1969, 1970), and between family status and actual educational attainment (Cope, 1970; Gottleib, 1974; Jencks et al., 1972; Sewell et al., 1957, 1969, 1970; Shea, 1971). Parents still seem to view education as more important for their sons than for their daughters (Brook et al., 1974). Such distinctions may be particularly discouraging to women, for whom parental support for aspirations is particularly important (Meier, 1969). Investigations of the educational attainment process indicate that sex and social class interact to create a double liability for women, with women from less advantaged backgrounds least likely to attain high levels of education (Alexander and Eckland, 1974; Carnegie Commission, 1973; Cross, 1971). Although the situation probably is not so extreme today, the statement of a working-class mother interviewed by Rainwater et al. (1959) is instructive: "I don't worry about their becoming famous. Naturally, I want the boy to go to college and the girl to be good" (p. 95).[8]

To the extent that differences in the degree of educational aspirations among different social class groups have narrowed, the important differences may now be in the modes of support for aspirations and the meaning of an education for different social groups.[9] Meier (1969) notes differences in the types of support offered for educational aspirations by parents at different status levels. Higher status parents are more likely to provide strong implicit support, in which a child's college attendance is taken for granted and its importance is embodied in the parents' total life style. Strong explicit support, defined as active parental encouragement or persuasion, is not related to social status.[10] Supported autonomy, in which parents react positively to a student's educational plans, but play a passive role in implementing them; and non-support, where parents, most often fathers, are indifferent or negative about their child's educational aspirations, are patterns more characteristic of lower status parents. Few women report biparental nonsupport, and those whose fathers are nonsupportive are more likely to report strong explicit support from their mothers than are men with nonsupportive fathers. These findings about modes of support for educational aspirations among different social class groups are corroborated by the findings of the pilot study (Guttmacher, 1971). Also, the implication that strong explicit maternal support may be an important catalyst for mobility and high educational aspirations among less advantaged women is validated by a number of other studies, though, unlike Meier's findings, maternal support seems to be important regardless of a child's sex (E. Cohen, 1965; R. Ellis and Lane, 1963; Krauss, 1964;

---

[8] There is some evidence that if a working-class woman gets to college, she is as likely as other women to have graduate school aspirations (J. Davis, 1964; Wegner, 1969), and she is more likely to actually obtain postgraduate education (Rossi, personal communication cited in Husbands, 1972; Wegner, 1969).

[9] However, Sandis (1970) has demonstrated that a mother's educational desires for her children have more effect on their aspirations than do any specific socialization techniques she uses in the attempt to implement these desires.

---

[10] The findings of the pilot study (Guttmacher, 1971) suggest that, while parents at all status levels may provide strong explicit support, the specific types of support offered vary, based on parents' differential resources. For example, one way all parents encourage their children to go to college is by supporting their academic achievement efforts, but educated parents are more able, or inclined, to help their children with their school work, provide reading material in the home, and discuss ideas with their children. Being less familiar with, or feeling less able to define educational requirements, working-class parents focus their support on the visible activities associated with academic achievement by insisting their children do their homework or rewarding them for good grades. Also, they are more likely to verbally assault their children from an early age about the importance of a "good" education (also see Kahl, 1953).

Tomeh, 1968).

Since Meier's respondents all were college students, it appears that educational aspirations can be realized under a variety of support conditions. However, based on significant other theory, strong implicit support and the middle-class version of strong explicit support ought to be more effective, as parents act as both models of educational attainment and knowledgable definers of what one must do to realize educational goals. Lower status parents have less knowledge of educational requirements and fewer financial resources through which to provide instrumental support. Social-emotional support, equivalent to the supported autonomy pattern, is less effective when used alone than when used in concert with instrumental support relevant to the task.

Finally, as suggested in Chapter I, while social class differences in certain attitudes and values, perhaps including educational aspirations, may be narrowing, the meaning of these aspirations may still differ. If one looks at parental views of the functions of an education, a distinction between the working-class emphasis on the functional value of education and the middle-class emphasis on its symbolic value is quite clear.

Working-class parents who want their children to get a college education see education as vocational training, leading to a better job, defined as an occupation that is more financially remunerative and secure than their own (Barton, 1959; A. Cohen and Hodges, 1963; Gans, 1962; Handel and Rainwater, 1964; S. M. Miller and Riesman, 1961a, 1961b). Handel and Rainwater (1964) suggest that working-class parents stress this utilitarian view of education most strongly with daughters, towards whose education they feel more ambivalence, fearing that college is a "waste" for a woman ". . . unless she both completes the course and applies what she has learned in an occupation--school teaching being the occupation usually mentioned illustratively" (p. 38).

On the other hand, middle-class parents see vocational preparation as important, but conceive of the value of education, especially the education of daughters, in broader terms. They believe education has prestige value whether it is used in a job or not, and may view college as a "status-finishing" process for daughters. A college-educated woman will be well-rounded, more refined, enjoy life more, have educated tastes and an appreciation of ideas, get along well with others, and, as a result, be a better wife and mother (Aberle and Naegele, 1952; Barton, 1959; Handel and Rainwater, 1964; Malpass and Symonds, 1972; Meier, 1969; S. M. Miller and Riesman, 1961a; R. Turner, 1964b).

These value differences may have implications for career salience among women from different social class backgrounds. Pressure from parents to justify their college education by using the skills developed in a job may predispose women from working-class backgrounds to consider work as an important part of their future plans. In fact, there is some evidence that women from lower status backgrounds who reach college are more determined than other women to use their skills (Douvan, 1959; Wegner, 1967). On the other hand, there is no work expectation implicit in the values of middle-class parents. Rather, there is a suggestion that the value of a college education lies in its ability to enhance women's performance in expressive, family roles.

Although these hypotheses seem plausible, the one study that considers the influence of parents' views of the purposes of an education on career-orientations among women finds no relationship between these two attitudes (A. Siegel and Curtis, 1963).

Parents' sex role attitudes. Parents impart sex role messages to their children through their socialization techniques and advice, as well as in their roles as models of sex role performance. Based on the argument that strong career salience is based on differential sex role conceptions, and the fact that a woman's own sex role ideology seems to be strongly related to her degree of career salience, it would seem worthwhile to consider parents' sex role advice, perhaps particularly their views about working women, as an important precursor of career salience. Also, the degree to which parents emphasize the acquisition of traditional sex-typed characteristics and distinguish between the behavior expected of daughters and sons may affect their daughter's sex role conceptions and the development of other attributes that are supportive of career interests.

I found three studies that consider the relationship between aspects of parents' sex role attitudes and daughters' degree of interest in a career. Ginn (1968) found that women whose parents have traditional sex role expectations prefer to be homemakers, while daughters of parents with achievement-oriented female role expectations have strong interests in a career. Hanley (1974) asked college women to report their parents' attitudes towards the career involvement of women with young children, and found a positive relationship between parental attitudes and women's proposed degree of career commitment, with the mother's attitude discovered to be one of six important predictors of career commitment. Vetter and E. Lewis (1964) found no particular pattern of parental attitudes towards a wife who works for pay among women who were career-oriented, while those who were homemaking-oriented reported that their parents disapproved of such work involvement among women. Although the available evidence is limited, there is a suggestion that it may be worthwhile to consider differential parental sex role attitudes as one mechanism through which parents influence women's career salience.

If egalitarian sex role prescriptions by parents are important to the development of career salience, working-class women are at a disadvantage, as lower- and working-class parents tend to encourage traditional sex-typing more consistently than higher status parents, with the greatest social class difference being the amount of stress on the femininity training of daughters (Bronfenbrenner, 1961a; Hartley, 1964b; Kagan, 1972; Kohn, 1959; Komarovsky, 1967; LeMasters, 1975; Rabban, 1950; Sears et al., 1957). Thus, to a great extent, the sex role messages of working- and middle-class parents in their roles as definers of standards are consistent with their performance as models, with the important exception of the fact that working-class mothers are more likely to work outside the home.

The combined effects of parents' influence as models and definers of "correct" sex role behavior in working-class and middle-class families generally is mirrored in their daughters' sex role attitudes and sex-typed behavior. Working-class girls conform more to traditional sex role standards, differentiate more between male and female roles, exhibit sex-typed characteristics earlier, and express more conservative sex role ideologies than do middle-class girls (Allgeier, 1975; E. Davis, 1964; Entwisle and Greenberger, 1970; Gaskell, 1973; Kagan and Moss, 1962; Landreth, 1963; Meier, 1972; Rabban, 1950). Hartley's studies (1961a, 1961b, 1964a, 1964b) of upper-middle- and lower-middle-class girls suggest that they share conceptions of what girls and women do, but they differ in their preferences, with upper-middle-class girls more likely to reject the work roles (housekeeping) associated with being a female child or adult woman, a pattern that is mirrored in the preferences of adult women in different social class groups (Komarovsky, 1967).

Overall, it would appear that the traditional and more exacting sex role standards of working-class parents should serve as a brake on their daughters' interest in a career, while middle-class women may have more room in which to explore career possibilities, while still meeting their parents' sex role expectations. Still, there is conflicting pressure from the fact that working-class mothers may tell their daughters: "A woman's place is in the home," while they themselves are out working, and while their financial contributions have resulted in their having more family decision making authority than a woman "should" have. Haavilo-Mannila's (1967) detailed study of sex role behavior and attitudes among Finnish men and women shows evidence of inconsistency in attitudes among lower- and working-class respondents, with conflicts revolving around this work reality/home expectation issue. Also, E. Davis (1964) found that, while "blue-collar" girls saw their future roles as centered on the care of husbands and children, they still were more likely than middle-class girls to feel that most women would like to have a job in addition to a family. Although in their roles as definers, working-class parents may transmit a consistent, traditional sex role message, their daughters may still see some flexibility in their parents' expectations due to the difference between what they say and what they do.

Other aspects of family structure. A few researchers have considered the relationship between other aspects of family structure, such a whether both parents are present, family size, sex of siblings, and birth order of the respondent, and degree of career salience among women. Having divorced or deceased parents might increase a woman's degree of interest in career preparation, due to her personal experience with these contingencies that may force a woman to work. In Angrist and Almquist's (1975) relatively high status sample, few women had experienced the divorce or death of parents, and there was no difference in incidence related to career salience. However, in B. Turner's (1972) samll sample of state university women, parental separation or divorce was related to high career expectations.

The potential effects of family size are not clear. Bossard (1953; Bossard and Boll, 1955) notes more role specialization in large families, with children allowed considerable autonomy in choosing their roles. The large family system provides a sense of emotional security for its members, but this may turn into too much dependence on family members (Bossard, 1956). B. Rosen (1961) suggests that children in small families are given more achievement and independence training, while in large families, obedience and conformity are emphasized. While, in a large family, a woman may be allowed to choose a career-oriented role, it appears that the small family provides the achievement training necessary to implement this choice. This may explain Rapoport and Rapoport's (1971a) finding that women engaged in dual career marriages come from smaller families than women following a conventional, less career-salient life style pattern.

A related issue concerns the relative importance of extended family ties, which are stronger in working-class than in middle-class families (Rainwater et al., 1959; Rainwater and Handel, 1964; Komarovsky, 1967, 1970). Parsons and his followers (Parsons and Bales, 1955; Stuckert, 1963) argue that strong extended family ties are inimical to social mobility, while Litwak (1960a, 1960b) suggests that such communal involvement can serve as an important source of support for the conflicted, mobile individual. Also, extended families and large families provide more people with whom to identify and from whom to gain support. In fact, Krauss (1964) and Tomeh (1968) note that other relatives are cited more often as sources of support for and influence on aspirations by working-class and lower-class youth. The working-class woman may have more familial significant others, who provide a wider variety of role models from which she can choose, than does the middle-class woman. This suggests that it is important to consider the influence of other family members, as well as parents, as models and definers of the value of a career-salient life style. However, the one study that considers the relationship of career-orientation to familial involvement found that women who had had intense, extensive relationships with all family members during their childhoods were more likely to be homemaking-oriented than to be career-oriented (Rossi, 1965a).

Another aspect of family composition that might affect career salience among women is the sex of their siblings, though the nature of the potential effect is not clear. Some researchers have suggested that if their are no sons in a family, a daughter may become the object of parental, particularly paternal, wishes for a male heir, and be directed towards what are traditionally male activities, such as achievement and a career (Helson, 1971). On the other hand, if one has brothers, one is exposed indirectly to the masculine socialization emphases of parents, and brothers themselves may serve as socialization agents and role models. To the degree a woman sees male activities as more attractive than those in which she is encouraged to engage, she may develop masculine characteristics and interests herself (Brim, 1958). The one study that considers the relation of sex of siblings to career salience (Angrist and Almquist, 1975) found no relationship.

Other studies indicate that the effect of the sex of siblings on women's role conceptions may differ depending on birth order. An older brother may be more likely than a younger brother to be viewed as a role model. Women with an older brother may incorporate some of his characteristics into their own self-concept and role conceptions (Altus, 1971; Brim, 1958; Kammeyer, 1967). One study indicates that women with an older brother are more likely to be employed as adults than are other women (Fogarty et al., 1971). The younger of two sisters may be given more leeway to define her own sex role conceptions (Defabaugh, 1975; Kammeyer, 1967), although such women were overrepresented in both the career-oriented and nonworking groups in Fogarty et al.'s (1971) sample. However, if all children are female, the eldest sister is most likely to be the replacement for a male heir (Defabaugh, 1975), and is more likely to be employed as an adult (Fogarty et al., 1971).

Those studies that look at the effects of birth order alone report contradictory findings. Firstborn and only children face special pressures, and tend to have stronger achievement needs and stronger desires to conform to parents' expectations than other children (Altus, 1965; Schacter, 1963). Rapoport and Rapoport (1971a) found that women involved in a dual career marriage were more likely than nonworking women to be firstborn or only children, while Angrist and Almquist (1975) detected no relationship between birth order or being an only child and career salience in college women. Fogarty et al. (1971) reported that only children were overrepresented in both the career and nonworking groups in their sample of British university graduates.

Although the potential effects of birth order and sex of siblings on career salience among women is confusing, it seems that one might expect to find the greatest degree of interest in a career among women who have an older brother, or no brothers, who are firstborn, or who are only children. However, it appears that not all parents treat children in systematically different ways depending on their birth order and the sex composition of the family. The nature of specific parents' sex role messages probably is more important than family composition per se in determining women's degree of interest in a career.

Although only incomplete data is available to document many of the suggestions made above about ways in which parents might influence their daughter's interest in a career, there is enough evidence to support the general proposition that differential socialization experiences in the family may help to explain variations in degree of career salience among women. However, there also is evidence of gaps in support structures, particularly for women from working-class families, that might be filled by significant others from outside the family circle.

The Influence of Teachers and Male Peers on Career Salience

Both the enrichment and deviance hypotheses propose that nonfamilial significant others affect women's decisions to turn towards or away from a career. The enrichment model suggests that highly career-salient women are exposed to and influenced by a wider variety of role models, including models who follow a career-salient life style pattern. The deviance model depends in part on the assertion that highly career-salient women turn to a career out of frustration in areas of feminine concern, such as social relationships, especially relationships with men.

I have chosen to focus on two other groups of potential significant others, teachers and male peers, for several reasons. First, studies of the influence of significant others on other important adolescent decisions, such as educational aspirations and vocational choice, indicate that parents, teachers, and peers are the most influential reference groups (see for example, E. Davis, 1964; Denzin, 1966; Guttmacher, 1971; Herriott, 1963; Krauss, 1964; Reed, 1966;

Roe, 1956). In college, teachers are an important audience for whom students perform and who give the most direct feedback about the adequacy of one's performance in the preparatory student role. For women from working-class backgrounds, teachers also may be an important normative reference group, communicating the standards and values of the middle class, the group to which upwardly mobile women aspire. Also, college professors are likely to be career-salient themselves, so that, to the degree women identify with them, they might be expected to direct women towards a career.

Peers also can serve comparative and normative functions.[11] The female role expectations of male peers may have special legitimacy because of the concern of college-age women with the contingency of finding a spouse. There is ample evidence that women worry a lot about what men think, particularly about what they think about high achievement and strong career interests in women; that most women, regardless of their own sex role conceptions, view men as relatively conservative in sex role attitudes; and that the difference between women's personal role conceptions and their perceptions of men's expectations is an important source of role conflicts for women (F. Gordon and D. Hall, 1974; Hanson, 1974; Hawley, 1971; Horner, 1970, 1972a; Parelius, 1975;

---

[11] Very few researchers have considered the effects of the expectations of female peers on women's ability to redefine their sex role conceptions to include a significant career component. By excluding them here, I do not mean to discount what probably is their powerful influence. Their exclusion is indicative of how little we know about them, and how much research in this area is needed. However, I would argue that the expectations of same-sex peers may have more influence at earlier ages. During the college years, the immediacy of marriage plans infuses the expectations of male peers with extra legitimacy.

Steinmann et al., 1964). To the extent that women's perceptions of male attitudes are accurate,[12] male peers may be a group of significant others who turn women away from a career. On the other hand, male peers probably are likely to have strong career interests themselves, and women might take them as models, internalizing a similar identity, and not just a reciprocal identity, based on the amount of contact that they have with men.

Only a few researchers have considered the degree to which teachers and peers affect career salience in women, and even fewer have tried to explain how these groups implement their influence. There is evidence that highly career-salient women are influenced by a greater number of people in making their decisions than are other women (Almquist and Angrist, 1971; Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Simpson and Simpson, 1961). Two studies report that highly career-salient women are more likely to feel that teachers, professors, and work role models had a lot of influence on their life style plans than are less career-salient women (Almquist and Angrist, 1970, 1971; Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Simpson and Simpson, 1961). However, Parker (1966) found no difference in significant other support structures related to degree of career salience, and Veres (1974) discovered that, in a sample of junior college women, the career-committed women perceived less support for their career plans from college counselors and teachers than did other women.

---

[12] There is some evidence that, although men's sex role expectations may be becoming more egalitarian in some areas, such as their willingness to accept, or even prefer, an intelligent woman; when it comes to having one's future wife continuously involved in a career, men still are quite traditional, and negative (Komarovsky, 1973).

Simpson and Simpson (1961) found that what distinguishes the support structures of noncareer-salient women is the importance of the influence of peers and family members, while Almquist and Angrist (1970, 1971; Angrist and Almquist, 1975) discovered no differences in degree of career salience related to amount of peer influence, and only a slight tendency for noncareer-salient women to be more influenced by family members. They assert that the distinguishing characteristic of women who are not interested in career involvement is that they tend to say they were not influenced by anyone. Since all their respondents were college students and family members, it is not that the noncareer-oriented lack role models, but that they are less willing or able to enter into relationships with potential significant others (Almquist and Angrist, 1970, 1971; Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Simpson and Simpson, 1971).

Angrist and Almquist (1975; Almquist and Angrist, 1971) are the only researchers who have tried to explain exactly what it is that teachers do that seems to lead to the development of stronger career interests among women. Policy makers have suggested that access to female faculty members who are career-salient and who have combined marriage and a career successfully is important (Carnegie Commission, 1973; E. Lewis, 1969), and there is experimental evidence that even short term exposure to female career role models can lead to the heightening of career interests among women (E. Elliott, 1972; Pope, 1971; Tibbetts, 1975). However, Angrist and Almquist (1975; Almquist and Angrist, 1971) did not find female faculty members, who were scarce in the institution studied, to be any more important than male faculty members in the support structures of career-salient women. The one difference they did find was that career-salient women were more likely to believe that their teachers consider them bright, outstanding students than were noncareer-oriented women (Almquist and Angrist, 1971).

Attempts to explicate the influence of male peers on career salience have focussed on the issue of whether strong interest in a career is an outgrowth of a lack of success in relationships with males, and thus, represents a negative choice based on a belief that one will not be able to fulfill marital aspirations. Rossi (1964) and Sedney and B. Turner (1975) found that highly career-salient women report that they began dating at a later age than did other women. Rossi (1964) also notes that highly career-salient women date less, while Angrist and Almquist (1975; Almquist and Angrist, 1970) report no difference in dating frequency related to degree of career salience, and only a slight tendency for less career-salient women to be more likely to be engaged or going steady during college. Sedney and B. Turner (1975) tried to test whether the relatively low dating frequency of highly career-oriented women is a cause of high needs for achievement and strong career interests or an effect of achievement needs, in which a woman chooses to reduce heterosexual involvements in order to focus on attaining other goals. They were unable to prove the empirical relevance of either of these theoretical causal sequences.

Cook (1967) found that homemaking-oriented women are more influenced by men in making their decisions than are career-oriented women. However, Angrist and Almquist (1975) discovered that career-salient women were more likely to discuss career plans with men than were other women. Gysbers et al. (1968) found that career-oriented women prefer men over women for social interaction more than do noncareer-oriented women.

Hanley (1974) reports that a college woman's perception of approval from significant males for her career plans is an important predictor of proposed career commitment. This finding fits with the overwhelming evidence that, for an adult woman, her husband's attitude towards her employment is one of the most important predictors of whether a woman will work and whether she will be strongly committed to her career (Axelson, 1963; Hoffman, 1963a; Fogarty et al., 1971; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971a, 1971b; U.S. Department of Labor, 1966; Watley, 1969; Weil, 1961). Bailyn (1970) found no relationship between a husband's attitude towards married women having careers and his wife's career-orientation, and concluded that career-family orientations are not the salient dimension on which mate selection decisions are made. However, the bulk of the evidence suggests that husbands' actual attitudes or wives' perceptions of spouse support are important facilitating factors in determining whether women work, and Hanley's (1974) data indicate that women do consider male peer attitudes in planning their future career involvement.

Discussion and Statement of Hypotheses

Following is a brief summary of the major findings suggested by the literature review, stated as hypotheses to be tested in this study. It is important to emphasize that since few studies have focussed on career salience as defined here, the literature can only point to potential variables of interest. Those studies that come closest to using a similar definition of career salience, particularly the Angrist and Almquist (1975) study, have been given greater weight in determining testable hypotheses. Also, since societal attitudes about women and careers have been changing rapidly in the last few years, in cases where there is disagreement, the findings of the most recent studies probably have more validity than those of earlier research. I state, and test, null hypotheses that apply in cases where the literature suggests that there is no relationship between career salience and the correlative variables studied. If these null hypotheses are supported, I hope that this study's findings finally will convince researchers interested in this variable to abandon areas of inquiry that do not help to explain the sources of career salience in women. This review also highlights areas where I feel there are major gaps in the literature, to which this study is addressed.

Components of Career Salience

Few researchers have focussed specifically on career salience, defined as the degree to which a woman considers work plans as an important factor in all life decisions. In particular, few have considered the conceptual implications of the finding that neither family plans nor work desires alone can predict which women will seek careers. One of the major contributions of this study is its use of a sex role conception framework, which suggests that choosing a career as an important goal involves the redefinition of a multiplicity of roles, with the relative emphasis on, and content of, family and work roles affected simultaneously. Based on the review of related research, the following hypotheses concerning the components of career salience are tested.

1. The career-salient woman views work as an important, relatively continuous activity. Almost all the measures and definitions reviewed include the degree of interest in work involvement as a central component of career salience. The career-salient woman will assign work high priority among the possible areas of life satisfaction and will plan to work during most her life, regardless of other life circumstances.

2. The career-salient woman considers work important for its intrinsic value and the opportunities it offers for self-expression and a sense of accomplishment. Another common dimension of definitions of career salience and related concepts is attitudes towards work, conceptualized differentially as affective response to working, values realized through a particular job,and motivations for choosing to work. Few researchers have tried to operationalize the concept of basic motivations for working, though it appears that this aspect of attitudes towards work most clearly differentiates degree of career salience.

3. The career-salient woman plans to consider career needs in making decisions about family plans. The literature has paid little attention to the areas where career and family plans intersect, as if career decisions are made in a vacuum without consideration of the

mutual impact of career roles and other adult roles. One of the major purposes of this study is to delineate more specifically which aspects of family desires are central to a definition of career salience. Studies of the conditions that facilitate the work involvement of adult women suggest that it may be important to ascertain the degree to which young women plan their family commitments in such areas as the timing of marriage and childbirth, the number of children desired, the preferred division of marital responsibilities, and the selection of a husband on the basis of attitudes towards a wife's employment.

4. The career-salient woman plans to obtain further education. Several of the definitions reviewed include educational aspirations or expectations as decisive components of career salience. I have suggested that there are conceptual problems with this assertion because educational plans have no specific career content and because one can be committed to a job that does not require high educational attainment. Still, additional education involves extra investment of time and energy and allows one to enter occupations that may provide more opportunities for obtaining personal satisfaction. Testing this hypothesis for a sample of nonelite women will suggest how generalizable this component of career salience is.

5. Career choice and career salience. Several researchers have included some aspect of the occupational choice process in their definitions of career salience. There is little agreement as to what aspects of occupational choice are crucial, with prestige, sex-typing, and certainty of choice being the most commonly measured dimensions.

I will consider whether these occupational choice dimensions are strongly and consistently related to other measures of career salience, but, I would hypothesize that the choice of a particular occupation and the decision to value work highly, while correlated, do not form a unitary construct.

Correlates of Career Salience

The review of the literature concerning personal attribute correlates of career salience suggests a number of hypotheses worthy of further testing. Also, by weighing the evidence that suggests that women who value a career highly do so because they are maladjusted or unhappy against the evidence that suggests that strongly career-salient women have made a positive choice that is an outgrowth of differential, broadening socialization experiences, one can evaluate the validity of the deviance and enrichment hypotheses.

1. *Career salience increases over the four years of college, with the most significant increase in career interest occurring between the junior and senior years*. Although the data on the effects of the college experience or maturation on career salience is somewhat contradictory, a glance at the dates of the relevant studies leads one to consider the possibility that the apparent contradiction is really evidence of cultural change, suggesting that, for contemporary women, the college experience can be expected to heighten career aspirations. This hypothesis could be tested best with longitudinal panel data, but comparisons of women in different college classes can sketch the broad outlines of change patterns. If upperclass women are more career-salient,

this would lend support for the enrichment explanation of career salience, as college attendance should lead to differential socialization. Increasing interest in a career with maturation also suggests a more positive view of the meaning of career salience.

2. Career salience is not related to actual academic achievement or ability.

3. Career salience is higher in women with a strong need for achievement or intellectual interests. Although there is some disagreement, the weight of the evidence suggests that it is not necessarily the most able women who choose a career as an important life goal. However, there is strong evidence that women who are attracted to achievement situations, have strong intellectual interests, or express the need to develop a sense of competence are more career-salient. Since a strong need for achievement is not expected in women, this might be viewed as deviant. However, such a need is valued in men and seems to facilitate their success in achievement situations, such as a career (see, for example, McClelland et al., 1953).

4. Career salience is positively related to educational aspirations. The evidence is quite clear that high career salience and high educational aspirations go together, so much so that I will consider educational aspirations as a necessary component of career salience. High educational attainment represents an investment of time and energy that may encourage people to use the skills developed. Also, the jobs one is able to obtain with more education may provide more

opportunity for meeting needs for accomplishment and gaining intrinsic satisfaction from work. Further education would imply differential socialization and exposure to a wide variety of role models, lending support to the enrichment explanation of the sources of career salience.

5. Career salience is not related to general educational and occupational values. Regardless of how occupational values have been categorized, there are deep disagreements in the literature as to whether desired attributes of jobs help to distinguish degrees of career salience. Only a few researchers have considered the possible relationship between career salience and valuing job characteristics that might facilitate the combination of family and work roles, and, for women, this might be a fruitful area of inquiry. No one has considered the relationship between motivations for college attendance and the strength of career drives. I have suggested that, if the level of educational aspirations is important, then, perhaps the meaning of those aspirations also is important for understanding career salience. I will consider whether characteristics considered important dimensions of the ideal job and reasons for attending college delineate degree of career salience, but, because of the lack of definitive evidence in the literature, the best possible working hypothesis is to expect that values do not help to explain differences in the degree of importance attached to work. It may be that such values are too remote to affect life choices, or that they are more impervious to change than are actual future plans.

On the other hand, little attention has been paid to values expressed as reasons for choosing to work at all, which studies of adult women have shown are quite different from values fulfilled through the choice of a particular job. I have suggested, and will test, the position that seeking personal satisfaction through work is a definitive component of career salience. Such a characteristic of strongly career-salient women would indeed be deviant, as the literature reports that most women work for economic reasons. However, concern with fulfilling a need for personal accomplishment through work is considered laudable in men.

6. Career salience is higher among women who chose their occupational goal early in life. Only a handful of studies have considered this issue, with the majority finding a positive relationship between early choice and high career salience. More information is needed before we can make a definitive statement about the importance of the timing of the choice, but this relationship is plausible. There may be a spillover effect when women choose an occupation in their early years, and remain committed to a particular type of work throughout adolescence, that leads them to begin to value the work endeavor itself as well as their particular field. More studies have considered the relationship of career salience to certainty of career choice, usually measured by comparing aspirations and expectations, but the findings are contradictory, leading one to conclude that there probably is no relationship between certainty that one will enter one's chosen field and career salience.

7. Career salience is not related to the prestige level of the occupational goal among college-educated women. Again the evidence is not definitive, and more information based on different types of study populations is needed, leaving "no relationship" as the best working hypothesis concerning the correlation between prestige of occupational choice and career salience. I would suggest that no relationship can be expected because a college education makes entry into society's more prestigious occupations, at least the minor professions, possible for a majority of those who obtain it. Few women aspire to the major professions, so the narrow prestige range of choices may account for the lack of a relationship with career salience. While I would expect women who choose the major professions to be consistently career-salient, there may be a broad range of career commitment among those who choose the minor professions that obscures any overall relationship.

8. Career salience is higher in women who choose occupations atypical for their sex. This hypothesis is not supported in all studies that have considered the relationship between career salience and the dominant sex in one's chosen occupation. While one might expect to see a positive relationship between choosing a male-dominated occupation and high career salience, this relationship may not be significant because of the complexity of the issues involved. I would suggest two explanations of why women who choose atypical fields might be more career-salient.

Since career salience is a normative aspect of the male role, career-salient women may gravitate to male-dominated occupations where strong career commitment is the rule, and, thus where they will find colleague support for their aspirations. Or, women who are interested in traditionally male fields may find their career aspirations heightened as part of occupational socialization, or determination to succeed in their career may be heightened by the greater obstacles faced by women in new career areas. Still, although one might expect women with nontraditional aspirations to be more career-salient, this does not preclude the development of career salience in their more typical sisters. I would expect to see a greater range of degree of career salience among women who choose the "feminine" professions. Some career-salient women may try to make their aberrant life style plans seem less unusual by committing themselves to traditionally female occupations.

Perhaps most important, the contradictory evidence concerning the relationships between all aspects of the occupational choice process and career salience suggests that deciding to value work highly and choosing a particular occupational goal are separate aspects of the career decision process. I feel researchers have focussed too much on career choice to the detriment of other lines of inquiry, such as family plans, that might better explain career salience in women. To the extent that there are relationships between career salience and occupational choice, there is support for the enrichment hypothesis, as career salience appears to be related to an opening up of the range of occupational aspirations. While career-salient women may make occupational choices that are atypical, and thus "deviant" for women, their choices show more individuation.

9. Career salience is higher among women who have had more, and more varied, work experience. Only three studies reviewed consider the relationship between a woman's own work experience and career salience, with two (Angrist and Almquist, 1975; Hanley, 1974) supporting this hypothesis. We definitely need to know more about how prior work experience affects attitudes towards work in the future. No one has considered the possible effect of the specific nature of work experience, including the effects of opportunities to serve in apprenticeship jobs related to one's occupational aspiration. I would expect that the opportunity to test occupational interests,or exposure to attractive jobs,would heighten interest in a career. On the other hand, negative work experience in deadend jobs might lessen such interest. More, and more positive, work involvement would be an enriching experience, based on differential socialization and access to a wider variety of work role models.

10. Career salience is higher in women with egalitarian sex role attitudes. The literature is fairly consistent in reporting a positive relationship between feminist or egalitarian sex role ideology and high career salience. This is a logical finding,as women who value a career must redefine their own role expectations to include a career component, and, to maintain attitudinal consistency, they also may rethink their views about what roles are appropriate for men and women in general. I would expect this relationship to be even stronger in this study, where the measure of career salience is itself based on personal sex-role conceptions. Egalitarian sex role attitudes still

are considered deviant in our culture, though they allow for the broadening of experience for both men and women.

11. Career salience is higher in women who plan to delay marriage.

12. Career salience is higher in women who plan to delay childbearing.

13. Career salience is higher in women who plan to have small families.

14. Career salience is higher in women who prefer an egalitarian division of roles in their own marriage. There is little information available about the family plans of college-age women. The four preceding hypotheses are based on suggestive evidence on the family configurations associated with working or not working among adult women. There is a major gap in the literature on the life style aspirations of young women, which seems to be based on the assumption that women do not plan their family roles in the same way they plan their career involvement. I believe, and hope, that this is not the case. I feel that family plans are so crucial that evidence of family role aspirations that would facilitate career involvement will be tested as definitive components of career salience. Unless a college-age woman plans to make adjustments in normative female family roles, her chances of realizing strong career aspirations are negligible. I would expect studies of career salience that do not measure family role expectations to have little predictive utility. Whether the hypothesized relationships

are evidence of deviance or enrichment is open to judgment. Delayed marriage and childbearing, and smaller families, are becoming the norm rather than the exception. Marital role sharing is still uncommon, though it enhances the possible areas of self-expression for both husband and wife.

15. Career salience is higher in women with positive self-concepts.

16. Career salience is higher in women who describe themselves in terms stereotyped as masculine. Although the self-concepts of women with varying degrees of interest in a career have received a lot of research attention, the evidence is not definitive. The amount of disagreement suggests that a focus on personality may not be the key to understanding career salience in women. Some evidence that career-salient women are lacking in social skills and may feel socially isolated, and the finding that career-oriented women do tend to have personality characteristics that are stereotyped as masculine, seem to be the sources of the interpretation that they are relatively maladjusted. One must ask the question: Adjusted to what? Women to whom a career is important do seem to be maladjusted to sex role stereotypes, but the "masculine" qualities they exhibit are highly adaptive to career success, and are socially desirable characteristics for an adult human being. Perhaps more important, the descriptions of career-salient women are broader in scope, whether the criterion is evaluative tone or sex stereotype, and less definitive, suggesting an individuation and personality enrichment that is not present in the profiles of noncareer-salient women.

Summary. The bulk of the data concerning related individual attributes supports the enrichment explanation of career salience rather than the deviance view. Women who view a career as an important life goal certainly are different from the feminine stereotype and hold variant views of the normative demands of the female role. However, the picture of career-salient women that emerges is that of strong, self-affirming individuals whose career goals are positive outlets for meeting achievement needs. They may be less secure in their identities because they have chosen personal solutions that do not yet have wide normative support. The personality data suggests that social isolation may be one outgrowth of this cultural lag.

The Influence of Significant Others on Career Salience

The research that considers the degree and nature of the influence of significant others on career salience allows one to consider whether high career salience in women is related to social isolation and conflictful family experiences, or whether it is a natural outgrowth of differential socialization emphases and broader significant other support structures. The information available is very limited, with only three areas of parental influence, closeness to parents, socioeconomic status, and mother's employment, considered by other researchers in any detail. The hypotheses in other areas are suggestive, based on logical theoretical relationships, rather than on the findings of other studies.

1. Career salience is higher in women who are not close to their parents, especially their mothers. The available evidence shows a definite pattern of psychological distance, low parental acceptance, and tense family relationships associated with strong career interests among women. It appears that a relatively distant relationship with one's mother is a particularly important precursor of career salience, but the evidence does not support the assertion that this gap in the support structure is filled by, and strong career interests are a result of, identification with one's father.

This hypothesis serves as one of the major underpinnings of the deviance explanation of the sources of career salience, which suggests that rejection by parents leads a woman to turn away from family life as a source of satisfaction and to turn towards a career. Lack of warmth in one's relationship with one's mother may result in rejection of the family roles she enacts. However, there is no evidence that career-salient women reject family roles; they simply redefine and add to them. Rather than interpreting less close relationships with parents as evidence of negative conflict, one could argue that some cognitive distance from parents allows a woman to be more autonomous and independent (Gump, 1972; Tangri, 1972). In fact, Hoffman (1972) has argued that girls have a harder time achieving a separate identity from their mothers than do boys, because they are not required to switch their initial maternal identification, and because they experience less conflict in their relationships with their mothers. She concludes that ". . . girls need a little maternal rejection if they are to become independently competent and self-confident" (p. 146). Thus, high career salience in women who are not close to their parents, and especially their mothers, need not be viewed as evidence of maladjustment, because the experience and results of conflict are not necessarily negative.

2. Career salience is not related to parental socioeconomic status. The theoretical discussion of the ways in which parental socioeconomic status might affect career salience in daughters suggests that there are potentially important pressures towards career salience across the whole socioeconomic spectrum, with high status parents, or more accurately, fathers, able to depend on their position as positive models of career involvement, and their ability to provide relevant instrumental support for the development of career interests; while lower status parents are potent negative models, and may advise their daughters not to follow their life path.

To the extent that there is a relationship between socioeconomic status and career salience, it appears to be curvilinear, with daughters of very high and very low status parents most likely to be highly career-salient. Since the sample studied here represents the middle ranges of the status hierarchy, such a pattern probably will not be evident here. In fact, the curvilinear theory suggests that very few of these women should be career-salient.

No one has considered the relationship of parental status consistency to career salience. The literature on sources of educational aspirations, particularly among working-class youth, suggests that maternal status dominance is an important predictor of high aspirations. I will consider whether a similar pattern holds for career salience, as well as considering the influence of other types of cross-class pressures, but the potential effects on career salience are not clear, since high career salience in women is not any more esteemed in the middle class than in the working class.

3. Career salience is higher in women whose mothers have been employed outside the home. The majority of the available studies indicate that having a working mother predisposes women to plan a career as a significant part of their own lives. This is true regardless of how much, or when during her daughter's life, a mother worked. Support for this hypothesis would lend credence to the enrichment explanation of career salience, as women whose mothers are models of a variant version of the female role are themselves likely to incorporate work into their role preferences.

4. Career salience is higher in women whose mothers have been employed outside the home and who have enjoyed working. The one differentiating factor that attenuates or enhances the effect of a mother's employment on her daughter's degree of interest in a career appears to be the mother's attitude towards working. If a mother does not enjoy working, the potential positive effect of her position as an employed female role model on her daughter's degree of career salience may disappear. Significant other theory would support the contention that congruity between the messages conveyed in a mother's roles as a model and a definer of the value of work should increase her influence on her daughter's attitudes. Again, the importance of mothers as definers of the satisfactions to be gained from work suggests that career salience

in women is a product of differential socialization in the family.

The reasons a mother uses to justify her employment, the nature of her job, her husband's attitude towards her working, and her daughter's own feelings about her mother's employment, also may intervene to affect the degree to which a woman models herself after a working mother. Because we don't know much about the impact of these potential differentiating factors, their influence is considered here.

5. Career salience is higher in women whose parents share marital roles.

6. Career salience is higher in women whose parents encourage their daughter to achieve and to be independent.

7. Career salience is higher in women whose parents have high educational aspirations for their daughter.

8. Career salience is higher in women whose parents do not emphasize the enhancement of the performance of family roles as a reason for attending college.

9. Career salience is higher in women whose parents have egalitarian sex role attitudes. This series of hypotheses is designed to test the enrichment, or differential socialization model of the sources of career salience, which has not received an adequate test in other research. These hypotheses are based on the assumption that the hypotheses concerning the individual correlates of career salience will be supported. Also, they assume that women learn marital role patterns, the value of achievement and education, and sex role attitudes from observing the behavior and listening to the advice of significant others.

Parental behavior and attitudes are expected to be particularly important because of parents' positions as a woman's primary socialization agents. Although only a handful of studies have considered the particular mechanisms through which parents influence their daughter's degree of interest in a career, the available evidence tends to support these hypotheses.

10. Career salience is higher in women who were brought up in small, rather than large, families.

11. Career salience is not related to differential socialization based on birth order or sex of siblings. Particular configurations of family structure may affect the socialization emphases of parents, as well as affecting the degree and nature of the influence of siblings on role conceptions. The literature indicates that achievement and independence training are emphasized more in small families, while large families may foster affiliative needs more in keeping with the traditional female role. The available evidence is not definitive enough to suggest that one's position in the family age/sex hierarchy is a crucial determinant of degree of interest in a career. If aspects of family structure affect career salience, this finding would provide further support for the contention that career salience is a product of differential experience.

12. Career salience is higher in women who report that teachers and work role models have influenced their educational and career decisions. Although only a few studies have considered the influence of nonfamilial significant others on a woman's degree of interest in a career, there is a suggestion that highly career-salient women seek

out role models who will support their aspirations, and that teachers, and people who work in their chosen occupation, often serve this function. In general, there is a suggestion that career-salient women are more open to influence than other women. Perhaps this is because there are significant gaps in the support provided by their parents, while women with more traditional, marriage-primary plans may receive adequate encouragement for their aspiration from parents. Or, since career-salient women may be more emotionally involved in their educational and career choices than are other women, this focussing of energy may make them more open to influence by anyone who cares to give them advice.

There is very little information about exactly what it is that teachers and work role models do that attracts career-salient women to them, or, to posit another potential direction of influence, that heightens career salience in the women they influence. Is the important source of their influence their position as models of a career-salient life style, or their ability to serve as definers of a woman's degree of competence and potential for success in a career, or some combination of both? The issue of the nature of the influence of teachers is addressed in this study.

13. Career salience is higher in women who date relatively infrequently. The evidence concerning the relationship of career salience to amount of heterosexual involvement is not definitive, with two studies supporting this hypothesis (Rossi, 1964; Sedney and Turner, 1975), while Angrist and Almquist (1975) report no significant difference

in dating frequency related to career salience.

Empirical support for this hypothesis could be interpreted as evidence that career interests develop because a career is the logical option for a woman who believes that she may be relatively unsuccessful in the "important" arena of achievement for women, finding a mate. However, it is just as plausible to suggest that career-salient women focus more of their energies on school and career preparation, and choose to spend less time on social life, or that, given their variant sex role conceptions, they are more choosy about who they date.

14. Career salience is not related to the reported degree of influence of male peers on women's educational and career decisions. The little information available suggests that all women may turn to male friends for advice, though the kinds of help sought and the reasons a woman is open to the influence of male peers may differ, depending on a woman's degree of career salience. Women with little interest in a career may rely on men for advice in a wide variety of areas, because their future plans depend on male approval. On the other hand, strongly career-salient women may be more likely to discuss *career* decisions with men, not because they value men's opinions more than those of women, but because male friends are better role models and may be able to provide more information about career planning.

15. Career salience is higher in women who believe that their special male friends approve of their having a career. Only one study (Hanley, 1974) has considered whether the sex role attitudes of significant male friends affect a college-age woman's degree of career salience, but studies of the effects of a husband's attitude towards his wife's working indicate that his support is crucial in determining whether his wife will work and whether she will be strongly committed to her career. Since being interested in having a career does not preclude wanting to marry, highly career-salient women need to take men's attitudes into account as much as do other women. Women who have a strong interest in a career may look for men who support their interests, or women involved in a steady relationship with a man who believes women should or can have careers may find that their own career interests are heightened by this support.

Bailyn (1970) proposes that most people do not make mate selection decisions on the basis of a potential mate's career-family orientation. However, E. Lewis (1969) suggests that young women who want a career need to insure that their husband will be cooperative and supportive of their career involvement *before* marriage if they want to implement their plans. It may be useful to determine to what degree women consciously look for a mate who shares their beliefs about whether women should have a career. In fact, the degree of importance attached to a husband's attitude towards his wife's employment may be one of the definitive ways in which career needs become a consideration in making family plans, and, thus, may be an important component of career salience.

Other than the issue of attitudes towards women having a career, there is little information about the specific nature of the influence of male peers on career salience in women. Do women who differ in degree of career salience also differ in the degree to which they identify with male peers, or in the nature of their identification? As definers, do significant males provide women who vary in degree of career salience with different kinds of messages about their competence? The study reported here considers these questions.

Summary. Proponents of the view that strongly career-salient women are deviant and maladjusted have pointed to the evidence that they have relatively tense relationships with their parents, and that they seem to be somewhat unsuccessful in heterosexual relationships, as support for their contention that strong career interests in women represent an attempt to compensate for negative affiliative experiences. However, the alternative hypohtesis, that strong career desires are a positive, natural response to differential parental values, or the result of the influence of significant others who believe that women should have careers, has not really been tested,with the exceptions of the support for this model suggested by the positive effects on career salience of having a working mother and having been influenced by teachers.

This review has highlighted what we know about social class differences in socialization emphases in the areas that seem to be important to the development of strong career interests in women. The weight of the evidence suggests that working-class women should be less career-salient than middle-class women because their parents are less likely to provide them with the socialization experiences conducive to the development of strong career interests. However most study findings show no relationship between career salience and social class background.

This contradiction may be explainable in two ways. It may be that, in choosing a college sample, one is studying only the daughters of working-class parents who want their children to "get ahead", rather than just to "get by" (after Kahl, 1953). These parents may share the middle-class values that are conducive to the development of career interests, rather than the more conservative attitudes predominant in the working-class.

Or, working-class women may be able to develop strong career aspirations in spite of basically conservative parental sex role attitudes, because they do not view their parents as adequate models and definers of the middle-class life style to which they aspire, and, thus, they may be better able than more advantaged women to discount those aspects of their parents'attitudes and values that do not fit with their own needs. A significant problem for working-class parents is that, while they may very much want their children to "get ahead," they are not themselves positive models of educational and career success, and they do not have the knowledge or financial resources necessary to provide adequate instrumental support for the aspirations that they inspire. They may encourage their children to view them as negative models, and suggest that they look for other sources of support, but that is a hard thing for parents to say, and probably an even more difficult thing for daughters who love their parents to do.

There also is evidence that working-class parents hold conflicting expectations for their daughters, and incongruous communications can dilute one's influence as a significant other. The inconsistency between the educational values and sex role attitudes of working-class parents is particularly striking. They expect their daughter to "use" her education in a job, and to accept the entire constellation of homemaking, child-rearing, and husband-serving roles as hers and hers alone to fulfill. To the degree that a woman sees these messages as conflicting, she may be less influenced by her parents. While conflicting expectations from significant others may engender some feelings of tension, they also give a person some flexibility to make her own choices. The tendency for career-salient women to be less influenced by their parents than are other women, noted by Simpson and Simpson (1961), may be even stronger in a predominantly working-class sample.

Whether middle-class parents choose to direct their daughter towards or away from a career, their influence on her plans probably is more decisive, because their sex role advice is relatively consistent, and because their status represents social power and competence that may increase their daughter's degree of identification with them and with their values. This may explain why Angrist and Almquist (1975) found little difference in amount of parental influence related to career salience in a predominantly upper-middle-class sample. If middle-class parents encourage their daughter to plan for a career, their influence on her plans probably is strong, because their own educational and career attainment allows them to be positive models, and gives them access to "technical" knowledge of how one can best implement career aspirations.

Because it is difficult to maintain commitment to a variant sex role conception in a support vacuum, access to other role models may be especially crucial for working-class women who are interested in a career. Teachers could fill this vacuum, but they also have some disadvantages as significant others. The role-specific nature of a teacher's interest may not provide adequate support for the total life style planning needed to maintain career salience. Also, teachers may serve only as an audience,or comparative reference group, rather than as a group that affects primary norms. It may be more difficult for working-class women to identify with teachers than it is for women who already share their middle-class norms. Although there is some evidence that upwardly mobile working-class and lower-class youth are more likely than more advantaged adolescents to report that their aspirations were influenced by nonfamilial significant others, including teachers (R. Ellis and Lane, 1963; Krauss, 1964), there also is evidence that working-class girls find it difficult to turn to teachers for support (E. Davis, 1964).

Conclusion

The review of the literature suggests that women plan a life style, not just a career. A measure of career salience must consider women's work and family desires if it is to have any utility in predicting future career involvement. Women who vary in degree of career salience also appear to differ in educational aspirations, career choice, sex role attitudes, family plans, and self-concepts, in ways that are consistent with their career desires. Significant others may turn women towards or away from a career in their roles as models and definers of normative female role performance.

The literature on the individual correlates of career salience provides support for the enrichment hypothesis, in that it indicates that strongly career-salient women have higher aspirations and plan their lives in order to meet individual needs, rather than in order to meet the demands of feminine stereotypes. Their choices are "deviant" because they are atypical for women, but statistical infrequency need not signify maladjustment (Angrist and Almquist, 1975). The literature can't answer the question of whether career salience is a result of rejection by, or rejection of, important reference groups, or whether it is a logical result of the variant values of these groups, because the differential socialization model of the sources of career salience has not been given an adequate test.

The following chapter describes the study designed to test the hypotheses developed on the basis of the literature review. The hypotheses concerning the components of career salience are operationalized and tested in Chapter IV. Chapter V then considers the hypothesized relationships between career salience and other individual attributes, while Chapter VI tests the hypotheses concerning the degree and nature of the influence of significant others on career salience.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction to the Study Design

This research project employs a cross-sectional case study design to investigate the career aspirations of college-age women attending a four-year state college. The sample was chosen by a stratified random cluster technique that approximates proportional representation of women in all four classes and all college majors. The instrument is an extensive questionnaire that uses a combination of closed- and open-ended questions to elicit information about the areas of interest.

This chapter explains the rationale for the methodological choices made in planning and conducting the study. Design, sampling, instrumentation, and measurement issues are considered in detail.

Design choices were made on the basis of substantive considerations tempered by limitations of convenience, access, cost and interest. The design chosen is that of a cross-sectional survey of the attitudes and behavior of a sample of women from one case study population. All data were obtained by self-report of the subjects.

A cross-sectional design has advantages for data collection and analysis. It is possible to collect data from a larger, potentially more representative sample with the same expenditure of resources necessary to follow a smaller sample over time. Also, one need not be concerned with the sampling problems posed by drop outs in a longitudinal study. In analysis, cross-sectional data is easier to interpret in that one does not have to deal with the distinction between reliability of measures and stability of individual attitudes over time that is so crucial in explaining panel study findings.

On the other hand, a cross-sectional design only can estimate, not establish, cause and effect relationships and changes over time. In this survey, subjects were asked to report attitudes and behavior at earlier periods of their lives and at the present time, as well as being questioned about their future plans. One can talk about cause and effect relationships between perceptions of past events and current behavior. In fact, I believe that current behavior and attitudes will be more affected by the individual's perception of past experiences than by the real dimensions of those experiences. The analysis reported here stresses correlation rather than prediction.

When dealing with the issue of career salience, the most interesting longitudinal study would be one that follows women after they leave college, allowing one to determine whether measures of their proposed life style plans have any predictive utility. Hopefully, the study reported here is the first stage of a longitudinal study that will consider how proposed life style plans are affected by the reality of later experience.

The second major design choice was the decision to depend completely on the self-reports of the respondents. Respondents were asked to report the behavior and attitudes of others towards them as well as reporting their own behavior and attitudes. Again, I would suggest that the subject's perceptions, rather than the actual behavior or attitudes of others are the crucial variables. The respondent's report of her own attitudes is a measure of those attitudes that are conscious and that the subject is willing to report to a stranger. One can only hope for honesty of response in a survey of this kind, and measure reliability to some degree by looking for consistency of response.

Finally, the fact that this study is a case study of women attending one college is an important design consideration. Because of this characteristic, it is not possible to make any claims of generalizability of the results beyond this population. I would like to explain the rationale for this choice and then will describe the population so that the reader can decide if the study findings may be applicable to other populations of interest.

As indicated in the introduction, while state college women have been studied in large-scale, national surveys, these have been relatively superficial treatments. I feel that we need more detailed information about the attitudes and aspirations of these women in order to meet their educational and career needs. Focussing on one school provides the opportunity for collection of detailed information about the respondents, while allowing one to maintain a relatively large sample size. Also, since my major concern is with family background correlates of career salience, it is useful to control the characteristics of the college environment.

The major disadvantage of the case study method is the lack of generalizability of the findings. Also, homogeneity may obscure the importance of certain population characteristics. To alleviate this problem somewhat, the analysis stresses comparison of this sample with women from very different populations studied by others in order to point out characteristics of the population as a whole that may be important in explaining these women's attitudes and behavior.

Subjects

Characteristics of the Population

The study sample includes 271 women between the ages of 17 and 26 who were attending a public four-year college. I feel that the college is a fairly typical representative of older, regional state colleges serving a non-elite student body. This is one of the types of colleges we must study if we want to focus on delineating the needs of working-class women, for they are most likely to attend the four- and two-year public colleges (Cross, 1971; Davis, 1965; Dunham, 1969).

The college is located in a small city in an eastern state. There are two junior colleges nearby, but State is the only public four-year college in the region. Most of the students live at home and commute to school. Only the special programs in music and nursing attract a statewide clientele. Because of this regional emphasis, I feel it is important to describe the communities the college serves.

State's primary recruitment area includes two small cities (population 90,000 and 70,000), a number of residential-industrial towns, some small towns, and several rapidly growing residential suburbs. Some students commute from the outlying suburbs of the major metropolitan area 30 miles away, but, in general, there is little connection with this major urban center. The area is highly industrialized but, except for the newer suburbs, business and population are in decline and have been for a number of years. At the time the data was collected, unemployment in State's host city was 12 percent.

The "old factory town" character of much of the area it serves plus the fact that State's tuition is only $250 per year are reflected in the social class background of the student body. No systematic data are kept on family background but the general characterization is that most of State's students are the first generation in their families to go to college and come from working-class or lower-middle-class backgrounds. In recent years, more middle-class students are attending the state colleges in response to rising costs at private institutions. The change in State's student body has come with the enrollment of the daughters of the lesser professionals and technicians who have moved from the metropolitan area to the new suburbs State serves.

State's history is typical of many older state colleges. It started as a normal school, became a teachers' college, and then became a full-service college when it began to add a liberal arts curriculum 15 years ago. Still, many of the students are in pre-professional programs leading to careers in teaching. At the time the study data was collected, State was just completing the development of its liberal arts offerings and beginning to respond to counter-demands for more technical training. Majors offered and student choices are clarified in Table 1, p. 158, which compares the choices of the population to those of the sample.

State is a small college compared to most public colleges and universities, with an enrollment of 1846 students at the time of the study. Three-quarters of the students are women, a characteristic that is probably related to its past history as a teachers' college. Increasing demands for publicly supported educational opportunities have led to some increase in enrollment, though the administration favors retaining its intimate character.

The public colleges in the state do not have an open admissions policy. Still, State's admissions standards are not high in comparison to those of the state university system or local private colleges. For the four classes studied here, the average acceptance rate is 40 percent. The median Otis Gamma IQ is 115 and median Scholastic Aptitude Test scores are approximately 490 to 500. Almost all students were in the top half of their graduating classes, and one-half were in the top quarter. Median high school grade point averages are in the C+ to low B range (Institutional Self-Evaluation, 1971).

Comparing State students to the American Council on Education's National Norms for Entering College Freshmen (1968-1971) it is clear that they are similar to other state college students in background, academic achievement, and, within the limits of college offerings, in major choice. Women predominate at State more than at other state colleges. Since I am studying women students only, this is not a major problem, but the sex distribution does seem to affect the majors offered and it may affect the general college value climate.

State is different in several special ways that I think might affect comparability with public colleges serving major metropolitan areas. While State is located in a city, it is a city with a small town ambience in an area that is somewhat isolated and quite homogeneous.

For example, 73 percent of the sample are Catholic. The student population includes few black or Spanish-speaking students, primarily because the minority populations in the area are tiny and little effort has been made to recruit minority students from outside the area. Also, there are few students who are from really poor families. In the sample, only four percent of the fathers are engaged in unskilled work or unemployed. Unlike many public colleges, all students must be enrolled full time and classes are held only during the day. While most students work part time and some work full time, most work to pay for their educational expenses or for extras rather than for self-support.

To summarize, the college population from which the study sample was chosen is similar to the populations served by most baccalaureate-level state colleges. The college is more comparable to the former teachers' colleges with a regional service emphasis than to the newer urban public institutions.

Sampling Procedures

Choice of the sample. The sampling method used here is a stratified random cluster technique. The stratification criteria used are graduating class and academic major. Only female students were eligible for inclusion in the sample.

The sampling procedure began with the decision that the sample should mirror the college population's distribution by graduating class and academic major. The choice of stratification criteria was made on the basis of theoretical considerations. As indicated in

Chapter II, I hypothesize that degree of career salience will differ with women's stage in their college careers. College major is indicative of potential differences in career choice. Although I have questioned the relevance of career choice to career salience in women, I wanted to be able to test this negative hypothesis. Also, I do hypothesize that women who choose male-dominated careers will be more career-salient. College major is a stand-in for career choice here as it was not possible to determine actual career choices ahead of time. Many liberal arts majors have no clear career alternatives, and women may change their major, so this is the best available, albeit weak, estimate of career choice.

The stratification criteria were used to choose sample clusters. All courses offered in the semester in which the study was conducted were classified according to the class and major group that would enroll in them, using knowledge of major requirements, course sequences, and pre-requisites. Courses which serve the same population were grouped and specific courses or sections of courses to be included in the sample were chosen randomly. The class lists for these classes, which list graduating class and major, were then surveyed to determine whether sampling within these classes would give the desired proportional distribution by class and major, while including at least a base sample of 400 women. The initial course groupings were quite accurate. No classes from the original random sample were dropped but four additional randomly selected classes were added in order to make up for small class size in some of those original selected.

The final cluster sample included 29 college classes, including classes in all departments, of all sizes, and offered at all times of the day. Within each class, an attempt was made to contact every female student.

This sampling method was chosen because of practical considerations of time and cost. The cluster method also has distinct advantages for response rate and allowed me to control the effects of differential questionnaire administration conditions somewhat. Disadvantages include the fact that some class lists overlapped or were inaccurate, but these problems were anticipated and controllable.

A more important issue is the question of what determines who will be in a class, other than the dimensions of graduating class and major. If friends attend classes together, a cluster sample may measure attitudinal homogeneity that does not exist in the population. Students who are similar to each other may choose to take a class with a particular professor. These are potentially biasing factors, but I think their effect is controlled considerably by the size of the sample and by the fact that professors were chosen randomly along with their classes. More important, students at State seem to choose classes primarily on the basis of the time of day they are given, in order to have time for their jobs. Also, because of administrative procedures, students at this college have little say in deciding which section of a required course or which elective course they will take. These factors make me less concerned about potential bias in universal sampling from randomly selected clusters.

The only exception to this rule of universal sampling within classes was the exclusion of women whose attitudes I might have affected from sample consideration. Women who had been students in one of my classes, primarily junior and senior education students; women who participated in the questionnaire pretest, primarily junior sociology majors; and women who were members of a women's group in which I participated were excluded. This decision was made in order to control potential bias introduced by my dual role as teacher-researcher.

In summary, while choosing a sample of randomly selected clusters does not insure that every individual has an equal chance of selection, it does insure that every individual's class has an equal chance of selection. Also, if students' methods for selecting classes are essentially random, one approaches a more perfect random design. At the same time, by stratifying clusters according to two dimensions of interest, the representativeness of the sample on these two characteristics is improved.

Methods of contacting the sample. The questionnaires were distributed in the randomly selected classes during class time. Due to the length of the instrument, it was not possible to have respondents complete the questionnaire during the class period. All classes were visited over a three day period. I gave a brief explanation of the purpose of the study and the importance of each individual's response. I handed out the questionnaires personally to each woman in the class and informed the students that I would pick up the completed questionnaires during the next class period. Most questionnaires were completed at this time, however almost all classes required at least one follow-up visit to pick up late questionnaires and to attempt distribution of questionnaires to people who had been absent at the first administration. In classes where there were still questionnaires out after three or four follow-up visits, students were asked to return the questionnaire to my campus mailbox and self-addressed envelopes were provided for this purpose. Problems of nonresponse were exacerbated by the fact that questionnaires were distributed near the end of the semester when absenteeism was high and students felt pressured for time.

One month after the initial questionnaire distribution, I followed up a sample of the nonrespondents by mail. Again, cost was a factor and it was not possible to send each nonrespondent a duplicate questionnaire and postage. I divided the nonrespondents into three categories, according to their importance to the study design. First I chose a random sample of all nonrespondents. These 25 women were sent a duplicate questionnaire and a letter. These women were followed up intensively, including some phone calls. Of this group, 21 or 84 percent responded. This group is used to represent non-respondents in estimates of the differences between respondents and non-respondents that may effect data reliability.

The second group included women in academic majors that were underrepresented in the initial sample. In particular, senior nursing majors were difficult to contact since they were participating in clinical training. This nonrandom, but important, group was also sent a questionnaire. The remaining nonrespondents were sent a note asking them to return the questionnaire and enclosing postage. Thirty-three additional questionnaires were returned late, either in response to my letter or without a reminder. Only two women specifically refused to complete the questionnaire.

Characteristics of the final sample. Of 380 questionnaires distributed, 289 were returned, for a response rate of 76 percent. In the data analysis, findings for a base sample of 271 women will be reported. Questionnaires were completed by 17 older women with children. Since I would expect these women to be quite different in attitudes and background from the more typical college student, and since their numbers were not large enough for subgroup analysis, I have excluded them in this report. One woman returned the questionnaire, but she did not respond to a significant number of questions, so her case was dropped from further analysis.

Table 1 compares the population and sample distributions by graduating class and academic major, the two sampling stratification criteria. Estimates of the degree of sampling error indicate that the sample is representative of the population except for a significant underrepresentation of nursing majors and a slight overrepresentation of social science majors.

Crossclassification by academic major and graduating class indicates that nursing majors are most underrepresented among juniors and seniors. This problem is due to difficulty in contacting these women because most of their time is spent in hospitals. Though special efforts were made to reach these women by mail, their representation in the sampling frame was not adequate enough to allow for any nonresponse.

Table 1.--Comparison of the Sample and Population Distributions by Graduating Class and Academic Major

	Population Percentage (N = 1,327)	Sample Percentage (n = 271)
Graduating class		
Seniors	21.9	20.7
Juniors	21.7	19.9
Sophomores	27.1	31.0
Freshmen	29.3	28.4
Academic major		
Music	15.4	15.1
Art	6.6	4.8
Languages	4.0	7.0
English	13.4	13.3
History	7.8	9.2
Sociology	5.7	7.8
Behavioral Science	3.4	5.9
Psychology	12.2	12.6
Mathematics	9.2	10.7
Biology	2.3	4.4
Medical Technology	1.2	.7
Nursing	15.0	8.5[a]
Miscellaneous[b]	3.8	0.0
Major by type		
Humanities	39.7	40.2
Social Sciences	29.2	35.4[a]
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	27.9	24.4
Miscellaneous[b]	3.2	0.0

280 171

Table 1.--Continued

[a] A .95 confidence interval was computed for each sample proportion. Theoretically, if the sample proportion is a good estimate of the true population proportion, the known population proportion should appear in the interval. This is true in all cases except for the sample proportion of nursing majors (confidence interval = $.052 < p < .118$), who are significantly underrepresented. There also is a slight overrepresentation of social science majors (confidence interval = $.297 < p < .411$).

[b] The miscellaneous category refers to seven students who were in major fields serving only one or two students, 13 freshmen and sophomores who were listed as undecided, and 30 students whose major was not designated in official files. The 30 undesignated students were juniors who recently had been rejected by education programs. There was no way to estimate where these students would go, except to delete those majors that must be entered in the freshman year. For the sample, the miscellaneous category was represented by a random choice of women in all such majors. This raises the percentages in specific majors somewhat.

Other differences between the sample and population distributions can be explained by three general factors. The list on which the estimates of population proportions was based was compiled in the fall. By the time the data was collected eight months later, some students had changed majors. In particular, no students considered themselves still undecided as to major. Finally, the 18 deleted questionnaires that were completed by the older women who were in the original sampling frame account for some of the difference. Only two of these women were nursing majors, so their exclusion does not account for this significant difference.

Changes in academic major should not affect the proportion in any given major if these changes are random. I have no specific data measuring change patterns for this college, but my impression, based on changes in the sample and experience as a student advisor, is that students tend to transfer out of nursing, mathematics, and biology into the behavioral sciences. There also is some movement out of music into the other humanities. Studies where change in academic field has been considered in more detail corroborate this general pattern, especially for women, though no specific comparisons can be made since the majors offered differ (Davis, 1965; Angrist and Almquist, 1975). My impressions do indicate that slight differences between the sample and population distributions, including the overrepresentation of social science majors, probably do not represent major reliability problems.

I also would like to consider the representation of education students in the sample since participation in a professional training sequence has direct implications for career choice. At State, students are admitted to education programs at the end of their sophomore year. Music education is a major, elementary education is a supporting concentration, and secondary education is a minor. Juniors in elementary education are required to have an academic major, while seniors, who were under the old admission policy, major in elementary education and have an academic minor.

Table 2 indicates that education students are significantly overrepresented in the sample, with seniors accounting for most of the difference. It was difficult to stratify the sample by academic major and education program status at the same time. Only people in certain academic majors have education program options. Although the base sample included people in each academic major who were not in education, it appears that those in education were more likely to respond. I

Table 2.--Representation of Education Students Among Upperclass Women in the Sample Compared to Best Estimates of Their Representation Among Upperclass Women in the Population

	Population		Sample	
	N	Percentage	n	Percentage
Seniors	290		56	
Elementary education		57.9		66.1
Secondary education		8.3		12.5
Music education		7.9		10.7
All education		74.1		89.3[a]
Juniors	288		54	
Elementary education		33.3		37.0
Secondary education		9.4		9.3
Music education		4.9		11.1
All education		47.6		57.4
All upperclass women	578		110	
Elementary education		45.7		51.8
Secondary education		8.8		10.9
Music education		6.4		10.9
All education		60.9		73.6[a]

NOTE: Only upperclass students are admitted to education programs. The number of female education students in the population had to be estimated based on their proportion in the academic majors with corollary education programs because the available data on education students was not classified by sex. This assumes that women and men in a given academic major are equally likely to enter education programs, which probably means the population figures underestimate the number of female education students.

[a] Computation of a .95 confidence interval for the sample proportions indicates that, compared to the population, the sample includes more seniors who are in education programs (confidence interval = $.812 < p < .974$), and more upperclass women who are in education programs (confidence interval = $.654 < p < .818$).

283 171

believe that my association with the education department may have led to higher response from these students.

As Table 2 notes, the population figures used to estimate the proportion of female education students only partially take account of the propensity of women to choose education. If all education students are assumed to be women, the sample differences would not be significant.

The underrepresentation of nurses and the surplus of education students in the sample effects probable occupational choices, but it is important for this study only if women who choose these pre-professional programs differ significantly from other women in their degree of career salience. Education and nursing students were compared to all other students on the career salience index and 29 other potential correlates of career salience.[1] There are no significant differences in career salience.[2] On the other variables, nursing majors differ significantly from other students on the marital role ideology index, where they are more egalitarian, and they are more likely than those in other majors to report that they have become more strongly committed to a career since entering college.[3] Education students are more conservative than other upperclass women on the feminist attitudes index and they feel closer to their fathers than do their peers. There also is a significant, but weak association between being an education student and wanting to marry right after college.[4] These differences suggest that nursing students may have more nontraditional sex role conceptions than other students, while education students may be more traditional than most. However, since there are no significant differences on related variables and no apparent impact of these differences on career salience, the inaccurate representation of these groups in the sample would seem to have little effect on the overall reliability of the findings.

---

[1] The components of these measures are defined in the data analysis chapters that follow. The variables considered include the following: the career salience index, graduating class, the academic achievement index, grade point average in academic major, self-evaluation of academic ability, educational expectations, the family orientation index, sex stereotype of occupational choice, teaching aspirations, the marital role ideology index, the feminist attitudes index, evaluation of the women's liberation movement, exposure to the women's movement, importance of marriage, age want to marry, disappointment if can't have children, age want to have children, change in educational aspirations since entering college, change in career commitment since entering college, family SES index, mother's work history index, mother's feelings about working, mother's reasons for working, influence of mother on college decision, influence of mother on occupational choice, father's educational aspirations for daughter, mother's educational aspirations for daughter, closeness to father index, closeness to mother index, boyfriend's expectations for wife's working.

[2] Nursing majors: $\underline{t}$ (269) = .8883.
Education students: $\underline{t}$ (100) = 1.3407.

Other special characteristics of nonrespondents also could affect the reliability of study findings. In order to determine if nonrespondents differ from respondents in important ways, the random sample of nonrespondents was compared to all other respondents on the same 30 variables considered in the discussion of academic major differences.[5] There is no significant difference in career salience between the random sample of nonrespondents and other respondents.[6] Only two significant differences appear among the other variables considered. The random sample reports achieving higher academic major grade point averages and describes fathers with lower educational aspirations when compared to other respondents.[7] This implies that, had all those questioned responded, the distributions on these two variables might be different, but overall, this estimate suggests that the final sample is quite representative.

---

[3] Marital role ideology index: $\underline{t}\ (261) = 1.6691$, $\underline{p} < .05$. Change in career commitment: $\underline{t}\ (259) = 1.8092$, $\underline{p} < .05$.

[4] Feminist attitudes index: $\underline{t}\ (100) = 2.7227$, $\underline{p} < .025$. Closeness to father index: $\underline{t}\ (95) = 2.8794$, $\underline{p} < .012$. Age want to marry: Chi-square $(2) = 8.83789$, $\underline{p} < .012$; $\text{tau}_c = .07920$, $\underline{p} < .2012$.

[5] See footnote 1.

I have attempted to estimate all measurable differences between the sample and the population from which it was chosen. There are few, and relatively insignificant differences, with no apparent impact on the dependent variable of interest, career salience. Since the study begins with a limited population, the issue of representational accuracy is not as important as it might be in a study purporting to be widely generalizable. The sample may be considered a population of interest in itself.

Instrument

Development of the Questionnaire

The major data source is an extensive questionnaire that uses a combination of closed- and open-ended questions to measure the attitudes and behavior of interest. The questionnaire was developed on the basis of a survey of relevant literature, the responses of the women who participated in a pilot study,[8] and a pre-test of a draft questionnaire completed by 29 women students.

---

[6] t (269) = .8883.

[7] Grade point average in major: t (247) = 1.8660, $p < .05$. Educational aspirations of father: t (230) = 1.9492, $p < .05$.

A questionnaire was used as the major data collection instrument for several reasons. Written questionnaires have the important advantage of relatively easy administration at less cost than an interview. While I feel that smaller, interview-based studies of working-class college women are also needed, I felt that I had a good enough sense of the process of career decision making among these women to be able to develop a relevant standardized questionnaire. A questionnaire also has the advantage of reinforcing the respondent's feeling of anonymity, which hopefully leads to greater honesty of response. Questionnaires, particularly as administered here, do not force the subject to give an immediate response and allow for nonresponse to questions on which the subject has no opinion.

A questionnaire does not have the flexibility of an interview. There is no opportunity to probe in order to gain a clearer understanding of the meaning of particular responses or to clarify what appear to be inconsistent responses. While data obtained through use of a questionnaire may be more reliable because of the uniformity of the stimulus, an interview can give the researcher more information with which to judge validity.

---

[8] The pilot study (Guttmacher, 1971) suggested important variables to consider in this study, although it focussed on a different issue, the process of decision making among students who had chosen teaching as a career. The data consisted of written autobiographies submitted as a class assignment by 44 female education majors and focussed, conversational interviews with a subsample of 17 women.

The literature review provided ideas concerning specific questions to ask, as well as suggesting theoretical hypotheses worthy of a test. Whenever possible, I tried to replicate measures of concepts found to be important in explaining women's career and marriage attitudes in studies of other populations. The responses of the pilot study sample suggested additional motives for action and sources of influence that may be special for this type of population.

A draft of the questionnaire was pre-tested on a sample of 29 female students in a sociology research methods class. Most of these students were junior sociology majors. Students completed the questionnaire during class time. They also were asked to give methodological criticisms. Later, I returned to the class for a discussion of the questionnaire. The final questionnaire was developed on the basis of these women's criticisms and the content of their responses.

Structure of the Final Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in this study is included in Appendix 1. The questionnaire is organized into logical groupings of related questions, ordered on the basis of the relative sensitivity of different question areas and possibilities for contamination of later responses. The questionnaire begins with a series of factual questions. It then considers questions concerning educational experience and attitudes, work plans and attitudes, marriage and family plans, family background and parental behavior and attitudes, general sex role attitudes, college experience, and, finally, attitudes towards the women's movement. Interspersed throughout are the various measures of self-concept, which

I consider to be potentially difficult and threatening.

Whenever I felt that the range of alternative responses is fairly well known, fixed alternative questions are used. Structured questions have the advantages of providing a common frame of reference, being relatively easy to answer, and insuring coding reliability.

Most of the fixed-alternative questions avoid a forced-choice format, using Likert-style degree of agreement measures. I believe this procedure provides the most realistic assessment of attitudes, because people do feel strongly about varying numbers of beliefs. I particularly wanted to avoid situations which forced respondents to choose family or career, based on the theory that these need not be mutually exclusive options. In the case of all long item lists, items were listed randomly with controls for response set.

Open-ended questions are used where the alternative responses can not be ascertained and where very individualistic response can be expected. Open-ended questions invite problems with nonresponse and coding reliability. The replies to some of these questions are used primarily for purposes of illustration.

Analysis of Questionnaire Response Patterns

The structure of a questionnaire and questionnaire administration methods can affect patterns of response as well as having implications for data reliability. Questionnaires were completed at the respondents' convenience. The overall response rate probably would have been higher if class time had been available. I decided that the detail provided in the longer questionnaire was worth the possible effect on response rate and the potential bias introduced by different administration conditions.

The questionnaire instructions try to guard against possible biases inherent in the administration procedures. Of special concern are the instructions that the questions be answered in the order given and that the respondent not discuss her responses with others. The available data allow one test of the effects of different administration conditions. The great majority of the respondents returned their questionnaires on my second visit to their class, usually 48 hours after distribution. On the other hand, the 53 late respondents had the questionnaires for one to two months before returning them. A comparison of the late respondents to all other respondents on the 30 variables used for reliability analyses[9] provides an estimate of the possible biassing effects of different administration conditions. The only significant differences appear in the case of three family influence variables. Late respondents seem to be closer to their mothers and fathers and less likely to have been influenced by their mothers in making their occupational choice than other respondents.[10] It is not clear how administrative conditions could have affected responses to these questions. The measures of closeness to parents appear late in the questionnaire, and it may be that those who kept the questionnaire longer gave more thought to these items. Although these are important predictor variables, there is no significant difference in career salience or its other individual correlates between the two groups.[11]

---

[9] See footnote 1.

[10] Closeness to mother index: t (261) = 1.9746, $p < .025$. Closeness to father index: t (241) = 2.7313, $p < .005$. Influence of mother on occupational choice: Chi-square (1) = 7.01281, $p < .008$; $\text{tau}_b = .20542$, $p < .002$.

The length of the questionnaire probably had a direct negative effect on response rate, as well as affecting possible administration conditions. The length was cut by one-third after the pre-test, but still, the questionnaire required a lot of time and involvement on the part of respondents. The length seemed to have a direct effect on patterns of nonresponse on a few of the returned questionnaires, where subjects did not complete the last few pages. Since they answered similar questions earlier in the questionnaire, and the last questions were not particularly sensitive ones, time would seem to be the only explanatory factor for these missed questions.

More commonly, nonresponse can be explained by the type or sensitivity of the question. As expected, the greatest problems with missing data occur for the open-ended questions, especially for the Who Am I? (item 41.) and What do others think you are like? (item 47.) questions. There is little nonresponse on the fixed-alternative list questions. Some individuals did not like particular list items or felt the questions were not applicable to them. The coding system tries to retain differences in reasons for nonresponse with separate codes for "not applicable", "don't know", and no response.

---

[11] Career salience index: $\underline{t}$ (269) = .6399.

Only three questions on the questionnaire use a forced-choice format, requiring respondents to choose only three items from longer lists that represent the people who influenced their decision to go to college (item 19.), the people who influenced their job choice (item 32.), and activities of most importance to them in adulthood (item 46.). Although the majority of the respondents followed the directions on these questions, a number did not. This problem was handled by deleting the responses of those women who did not follow the directions, since their choices are not directly comparable to those of the rest of the sample. This does not pose major problems for the item concerning most important activities in adulthood, on which only 24 women made more than three choices, but the information base for sources of influence on educational and occupational decisions is reduced considerably.

Overall, questionnaire response patterns and comments added by subjects indicate that the items adequately tap the attitudinal and behavioral dimensions of interest and that the content of the questionnaire was of great interest to students. As the analysis will indicate, some questions were more successful than others in differentiating among respondents.

Procedures

The analyses presented in the chapters that follow attempt to accomplish two objectives: to describe the attitudes towards family and career and the family background of a little studied type of college population, women attending a nonelite public institution; and to consider the relationships between career salience, other individual attributes, and family background characteristics for this type of population. Therefore, response distributions for the entire sample on the specific variables of interest are reported, allowing comparison of this sample to other populations. Reports of relationships among variables focus on bivariate correlations between career salience, the dependent variable of interest, and other characteristics. Statistical methods used to accomplish this objective include, where appropriate, Pearson product-moment correlations, one-way analysis of variance, t-tests, and crosstabulations, with appropriate tests for statistical significance and strength of relationship.

The operational definitions of variables are presented as each specific concept is introduced into the analysis. Accurate measurement of variables depends on the reliability of coding methods and methods used to form composite indexes, as well as on asking the right questions. Procedures used and estimates of the reliability of the coding schemes and the composite indexes are summarized in Appendices 2 and 3, respectively.

Reliability and validity issues also are addressed throughout the analyses. Response consistency among independent measures of the same concept or between related variables provides an approximate gauge of data reliability. In one case, the measures of academic ability and achievement, population estimates were available for comparison to sample characteristics as an estimate of the reliability of subjects' reports (see Appendix 4). As for validity, each measure must be interpretable by standards of face validity. Wherever it was possible to define variables using different measurement tools, convergent and discriminant validity are considered to ascertain the independent effect of method (Campbell and Fiske, 1959). While longitudinal predictive validity can not be determined, one can consider whether correlated variables are related to other variables in the same way. Finally, for each measure, an attempt at a theoretical explanation serves as an approximation of construct validity.

Conclusion

Respondents were chosen from women attending a public four-year college. The sample was selected by a stratified random cluster technique with universal sampling within clusters. The sample classes were stratified so that the final sample approximates the population distribution by graduating class and academic major. The findings reported here are based on the responses of 271 college-age women to an extensive questionnaire developed on the basis of the literature review, a pilot study, and a pretest. The questionnaire uses a variety of question formats to measure attitudes towards and plans for future career and family involvement, as well as eliciting information about the roles of significant others, particularly parents, in affecting these plans. Analysis focuses on delineating sample characteristics and measuring the relationships between individual attributes, family background characteristics, and career salience.

The chapters that follow report the results of the data analysis, using the format and hypotheses derived from the review of the literature. First, the measure of career salience is developed.

The next chapter considers the relationship between career salience and other individual attributes, followed by consideration of the influence of significant others, particularly parents, on career salience. Finally, the deviance and enrichment hypotheses are reconsidered in light of the findings of this case study.

CHAPTER IV

THE MEASURE OF CAREER SALIENCE

Results

The literature review suggests several theoretical dimensions that are important components of career salience. In critiquing the available measures of career salience, I suggested several criteria for an adequate measure, which I also have applied to my own formulation. Briefly, these criteria are: the need for a multidimensional measure based on a variety of question formats to improve reliability; the need to distinguish between components and correlates of career salience, met by including only items that concern career plans and/or one's relative emphasis on family and career goals in the index; and the need to distinguish between one's personal values and plans and general sex role ideology. All items that met these criteria were considered as potential measures of dimensions of career salience. The final career salience index includes those items that seem to form a unitary construct, as measured by the tests of index reliability outlined in Appendix 3.[1]

As I suggested in Chapter II, a career-salient woman is one who considers work plans as an important factor in all life decisions.

---

[1] See Table 4, p. 189 for a summary of the items included in the final career salience index.

Specifically, the following statements concerning the components of career salience were operationalized.

The career-salient woman views work as an important, relatively continuous activity. Two types of measures are relevant here. Women were asked when they wished to work and were asked to indicate what three activities would be most important to them at age 30. Questionnaire items 36. and 37., concerning when women expect and wish to work, are similar to the Eyde (1962) work motivation items , although not all possible combinations of numbers of children or economic circumstances are included here. The items concerning when one wishes to work seem most relevant to the measurement of career salience. In general, expectations and desires are highly correlated. Almost all women expect and wish to work before marriage and after marriage, before having children. Only the items concerning work after having children distinguish among respondents. The choice pattern on the sixth item, wanting to work after one's youngest child has left high school, is problematic. It is the only "after children" item that is strongly related to wishing to work before having children, and is indicative of a work-interrupted-by-homemaking pattern in the sample. On the other hand, women who plan to work when they still have children at home also plan to continue working once their children are grown. Based on these differential patterns among the desire to work items and the correlations between these items and other measures of career salience, where the first and second items show no relationship, and the sixth item shows weak relationships, only the three middle items were included in the scale: before my youngest child is in school, while my youngest child is in elementary school, and while my youngest child is in high school. These items all imply that at least equal salience is given to work and family at the time when family demands are the greatest, when there are children in the home.

I feel that the overall degree of commitment to work, rather than working at any particular point in time, is the crucial component of career salience measured in these items. Therefore, responses to these items were summed to form a composite item measuring desire to work when one has child-rearing responsibilities. This approach avoids the problem of weighting the index too much with items using the same measurement device.

The second type of measure of whether work is valued as an important activity is the item in which women were asked to choose three most important activities from a series of eight that they might engage in at age 30 (item 46.). Three choices on this list specifically concern the importance of work: being able to advance to a position of authority in my job; contributing to the financial support of my family; and having a job outside the home. The correlations among these items and the correlations between these items and other measures of career salience indicate that the item concerning family support does not seem to be related to career salience. This finding matches findings concerning occupational values. Concern with work for its extrinsic rewards and for financial security is related to a job-orientation more than to a career-orientation. The important dimension of this item seems to be the concern for family security rather than the implied involvement in work.

Very few women choose both the advancement and job items. In fact, only 33 women, 13.5 percent of those responding, choose advancement as an important concern. However, these two items are related to other measures of career salience in similar ways. Therefore, in order to allow for a reasonable distribution on these items, women were given a career-salient score if they choose either having a job *or* advancement in their job as important activities.

The career-salient woman considers work important for its intrinsic value and the opportunities it offers for self-expression and a sense of accomplishment. I have hypothesized that reasons women give for choosing a particular job will not distinguish degrees of career salience. However, motivations for choosing to work at all may be a definitive component of career salience. Since measures used in the literature include both types of work value components, I have tested both of these hypotheses.

The occupational values scale (item 33.) asks women what characteristics they would look for in the ideal job. Concern with extrinsic rewards, including prestige, high income, and security, are negatively related to other measures of career salience for this sample. These relationships are not strong enough to indicate that lack of emphasis on extrinsic rewards is a necessary component of career salience.

This same negative relationship applies for the job characteristic "provides opportunities for advancement", which is positively related to the other extrinsic rewards measures. This would seem to contradict the previously cited finding concerning most important activities. Women who choose advancement as an important life goal in the forced-choice situation also choose opportunities for advancement as an important characteristic of their ideal job ($r = .180$, $p < .002$). However, while only 33 women consider job advancement as one of their most important adult goals, 138 women, 51.1 percent of the sample, consider provision of advancement opportunities as a very important characteristic of the ideal job. I believe that the important distinction here, as in the case of all the occupational values measures, is that the important activities question requires a woman to *choose* a work-related activity, while the occupational values scale *assumes* the woman is working. It appears that if noncareer-salient women must work, they would like to be able to advance in their jobs, but they would choose not to work at all if this were possible.

Two items in the scale measure a concern with being in charge in the work situation. Both of these, "be my own boss" and "have a lot of responsibility" are positively, but not strongly, related to high career salience. The items measuring a people-orientation and a self-expression orientation are highly valued by almost all the women in the sample.

While desired features of the ideal job do not seem to be distinguishing components of career salience, motivations for working are important. Women were asked for what reasons they would work outside the home (item 38.), with three reasons coded per respondent. The initial 50 categories of reasons clearly could be split into two broad categories -- extrinsic conditions and intrinsic satisfaction. Two coders were in complete agreement as to placement of motivations in these two categories. Predominant in the extrinsic conditions category are various expressions of financial need, for example: "to increase the family income," "if it were a matter of life and death," "to earn extra money." Also included in this category are reasons for working that imply a dislike for other options rather than a positive attraction to work, e.g.: "to break the monotony," "as a hobby," "children gone, want a change." Responses indicative of intrinsic satisfaction include such answers as: "for self-improvement," "to use my talents," "to feel like a complete person."[2] Women were given scores of 0-2, depending on how many intrinsic motivations they mentioned.[3] This measure has a strong, positive correlation with other measures of career salience, indicating that career-oriented women choose to work because of the intrinsic satisfaction work brings.

The career-salient woman plans to consider career needs in making family decisions. It is possible, though difficult, for a woman to have a career and a family. Most of the women in this sample plan to marry and have children, so the crucial issue is not whether they will have a family or a career, but whether they are able and willing to strike a balance between the two. Several types of items in the questionnaire indicate how much these women have thought about these issues and how willing they are to adjust family plans to career needs.

---

[2] These reasons for working closely parallel the motives cited by adult women in Sobel's (1963) study.

[3] Since only 69 women mentioned three reasons for working, and only three of these gave three motives related to intrinsic satisfaction, a score of three was recoded to two so that the distribution is not so skewed.

For example, women were asked what qualities they would look for in their choice of a husband (item 43.b.). One item specifically asks whether it is important that one's husband "wants his wife to have a career." This item correlates positively and strongly with other measures of career salience, with career-oriented women being more likely to be concerned that their future husband supports their career plans.

Because of the need for extensive training in some fields, the need to establish oneself in an occupation soon after training, and the emphasis placed on relatively continuous career involvement in our society, one might expect career-oriented women to plan to marry later, to plan to have children later, and to plan to have fewer children than their noncareer-committed counterparts. For this sample, the direction of the relationships between these variables and other measures of career salience are consistent with these hypotheses, but the relationships are not strong enough to include any of these family plans measures as a component of the career salience index.

The list of most important activities when one is 30 (item 46.) also includes family-oriented activities. The forced-choice format attempts to replicate real life, where one must balance interest in one area by reducing involvement in other areas. Women who score high on other measures of career salience are most likely to "give up" either keeping their house clean or spending a lot of time with their family. The wording of the family variable is important, I think. Career-salient women may reject the necessity of spending a lot of time with their families without rejecting the value and importance of having a family. The majority of this sample, including a number of career-salient women, choose this as an important activity, but those who do not are consistently career-salient. Career-salient women are even more likely to reject the importance of keeping a clean house. In the career salience measure, women are scored as career salient if they reject one or the other of these two activities.

Women also were asked whether they expect to face any conflict between home and work responsibilities and why or why not (item 39.). Few women, only 13 percent, felt there would be any problem combining the two. However, their reasons indicate that this does not mean that they do not perceive potential conflict, but that many of those who answer "No" have plans as to how to deal with what they appear to see as inherent conflict. The 47 different "solutions" suggested can be split into three general categories. Some women clearly indicate that family responsibilities will come first, for example: "if work interfered, I would quit work;" "I won't do anything to jeopardize my marriage;" "I will spend the majority of my time with my family." Others emphasize their personal "juggling" capacities and see no conflict, e.g.: "I can divide my time;" "I know how to plan constructively;" "I have always had home and work responsibilities." Finally, a third group indicate that career needs will be of equal importance or more important than certain family responsibilities and that their families will have to adjust somewhat to their career needs, e.g.: "my husband will share home responsibilities;" "my family will have to cooperate;" "I don't expect to do the full load of work at home; I'll do what has to be done;"

"I wouldn't marry if home responsibilities interfered with my life."

The important distinction here seems to be between those who plan some redefinition of family roles and all other women. That is, career-oriented women tend to indicate that some sort of family adjustment is necessary. Therefore, this item was dichotomized into family adjustment responses versus all other responses for inclusion in the career salience index.

Responses to the work-home conflict item indicate that the career-salient women in this sample are more likely to expect changes in family roles than they are to choose to make adjustments in job plans. Further information concerning attitudes towards choosing a job that facilitates combining career and family responsibilities is available in the occupational values scale (item 33.). Two job characteristics that specifically measure concern with family needs are "hours that fit well with home responsibilities" and "easy to return to after child rearing." Women who feel these characteristics are important are likely to be noncareer-salient, although the relationships are not strong enough to include response to these items in the index. Thus, it appears that career-salient women do not consciously value choosing a job that provides flexibility for meeting traditional family responsibilities.

Finally, women were asked how various family roles would be allocated between husband and wife in their view of the ideal marriage (item 43.c.). Almost all these women felt that responsibility for playing with the children, making decisions about the children's schooling, making decisions about major purchases, and punishing the children

A marital role segregation measure, scored as the mean degree of segregation over the four correlated items, is strongly correlated with the other measures of career salience, with high career salience associated with a more egalitarian division of marital responsibilities.

The career-salient woman plans to obtain further education. The literature reports a consistent positive relationship between educational aspirations and career salience. Because this relationship is so strong, many researchers have considered plans for further education as a necessary component of high career salience.

For this sample, three measures of educational plans are available. Women reported their educational aspirations, expectations, and when they plan to go to graduate school, if they plan to attend. Educational aspirations and expectations are consistently positively related to other measures of career salience, with expectations showing the strongest correlations. However, educational aspirations and expectations have the weakest item-to-item and item-to-scale correlations of any potential items in the career salience index and inclusion of either of these variables in the index reduces the amount of variance explained by the scale somewhat. Certainty of graduate school plans is weakly, though generally positively related to the other career salience measures, indicating that career-salient women are somewhat more likely to have definite graduate school plans.

Career choice and career salience. The literature also suggests several hypotheses concerning the relationship of career choice to career salience. It was difficult to test these hypotheses with this data base, due to the general homogeneity of career choices. For example, some other measures require that career-salient women choose professional over nonprofessional work. Only 30 women in the sample aspire to positions in the major professions, and only nine expect to obtain such jobs. Almost all the sample, 235 women, aspire to at least the lesser professions, while 169 expect to gain entrance to such occupations.

There is some support in the literature for the suggestion that career-salient women will be more decided about which occupation to pursue. While I have no direct measure of change during college for this sample, only 68 women, 26 percent of those responding, indicated that they had changed their career plans drastically since entering college. Only 13 women were unable to list a specific occupational aspiration, and only 62 have no definite expectation, the majority of these being teaching aspirants concerned about dwindling job opportunities in this area. Certainty of occupational choice, measured by comparing occupational aspirations and expectations, shows no relationship to other measures of career salience.

One indirect measure of degree of commitment to a particular occupation is the specificity with which women describe their aspiration. All occupational aspirations were recoded for specificity. For example, "teacher, scientist, or nurse" were considered to be somewhat general descriptions while "sixth-grade teacher," "marine biologist," and "play therapist in a pediatric ward" were considered to be specific. There is no strong relationship between specificity of aspiration and career salience.

Finally, the literature suggests that career-salient women will be more likely to choose male-dominated occupations. To test this hypothesis, all occupational aspirations were classified by predominant sex.[5] Feminine choices predominate for all aspirational measures, with current aspirations showing more "sex distribution" than earlier aspirations or occupational expectations. Still, 159 women, 61.2 percent, choose predominantly female fields, with 62, 23.8 percent choosing "neutral" areas, and only 39, 15 percent, choosing definitely masculine areas. While there is a tendency for women who score high on other measures of career salience to choose less traditionally "feminine" occupations, this relationship is not strong enough to include the predominant sex in the occupation chosen as a component of the final index.

Summary. The final career salience index includes those items discussed above that had consistently strong, positive correlations with each other and the total scale score. Table 3 summarizes the distribution of responses on the component items. Viewed as dichotomies, the response distributions indicate that only about one-third of the sample score as strongly career-salient on the typical individual item.

The career salience index score for each respondent is the mean of the nonmissing standardized scores on the component items, which are all coded so that the career-salient response is the "high" value. Since the index is based on scores standardized on the basis of response distributions for this sample, scores on the career salience

---

[5] See Appendix 2 for specification of coding methods.

Table 3.--Distribution of Responses on Items in the Career Salience Index

	n	Percentage
When wishes to work	267	
Never, when has children		43
When children in high school		27
When children in elementary and high school		16
Always, regardless of children's ages		14
Chooses advancement or job as important activity	245	
No		63
Yes		37
Reasons would work	259	
No intrinsic motivation		36
One intrinsic motivation		45
Two, three intrinsic motivations		19
Importance of husband's support for career	263	
Not at all		8
Not very		19
Somewhat		43
Very		30
Rejects family or clean house as important activity		
No		45
Yes		55
Solution to home-work conflicts	263	
Subject will adjust		74
Family can adjust		26
Degree of marital role segregation[a]	263	
Extreme segregation		33
Some segregation		30
Little segregation		37

Table 3.--Continued

[a] The marital role segregation measure actually is a relatively continuous variable, scored as the mean degree of segregation over four marital task areas, with scores recoded so that high scores represent less role segregation. The index has a mean of 2.376 and a standard deviation of 1.043. The categories listed here are for illustrative purposes only and represent the following scores: extreme segregation = .5 - 1.67; some segregation = 1.75 - 2.75; little segregation = 3.0 - 4.0.

index are meaningful only for comparisons within the sample. Also, the fact that respondents were given an index score if they answered at least four of the component items affects the distribution of the index scores somewhat. The mean score on the career salience index is .004, with a standard deviation of .666. The median is -.105, with a range from a low score of -1.182 to a high score of 1.577.

Tables 4 and 5 report the item-to-item and item-to-scale correlations and the corroborating factor analysis, respectively. Because of the central position this measure plays in further analysis, the reliability of the index was tested further for goodness-of-fit. Each of the component items and the composite index were split at the median into two categories, and responses were crosstabulated. All item-to-scale categorical correlation tests show chi-square values significant at the $<.00001$ level, with gamma values above .8 and tau_b values above .5 ($p < .00001$). All item-to-item correlations resulted in chi-square values significant at the $<.0001$ level, with gamma values above .5 and tau_b values above .2 ($p < .0001$). As these data and Tables 4 and 5 indicate, the career salience index meets all necessary criteria for reliability and discriminant validity.[6] The component items are highly correlated, and yet, each makes an independent contribution to our understanding of the concept of career salience.

---

[6] See Appendix 3 and Chapter III for a discussion of the standards of reliability and validity applied.

Table 4.--Career Salience Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
(1) When wishes to work							
(2) Importance of job or advancement	.3423						
(3) Reasons would work	.3432	.2541					
(4) Husband's support for career	.3719	.3213	.3305				
(5) Importance of family or clean house	.3243	.4179	.3116	.2763			
(6) Solution to home-work conflict	.3255	.3633	.2581	.2807	.2810		
(7) Degree of marital role segregation	.5151	.4406	.3569	.4332	.4603	.4163	
Career salience index	.6878	.6707	.6093	.6492	.6579	.6236	.7756

NOTE: For all correlations reported, $p < .001$.

Table 5.--Career Salience Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings

	Career Salience Index
When wish to work	.69624
Importance of job or advancement	.67765
Reasons would work	.58547
Husband's support for career	.63648
Importance of family or clean house	.65609
Solution to home-work conflict	.60868
Degree of marital role segregation	.79297

NOTE: One factor explains 49.0 percent of the variance. $KR_{20} = .7901$.

Discussion

The tests of index reliability support the inclusion of three general dimensions in an adequate definition and measure of career salience.

The career-salient woman views work as an important, relatively continuous activity. As in the case of measures used in other studies, the measures of when one wishes to work and the relative importance of work as a source of life satisfaction are central components of the index developed. As Table 5 indicates, these operational measures have high loadings on the career salience factor.

The career-salient woman considers work important for its intrinsic value and the opportunities it offers for self-expression and a sense of accomplishment. My attempt to operationalize the concept of basic motivations for choosing to work was relatively successful. The data suggest that such a dimension clearly belongs in an index of career salience. However, as operationalized here, using an open-ended question with responses broadly coded into two categories, the measure is the weakest component of the index. I would agree with Hoffman's (1963) suggestion that this is an area where interview-based studies might be helpful in improving our understanding of the reasons women choose to work. Based on such studies, and open-ended questions such as that used here, we could refine more standardized measures of motivations for working.

It also is clear that indexes that measure work motivations operationalized as reasons for choosing a particular job are not generalizable to samples such as this one. I believe the data suggest that values realized through the ideal job and values realized through the decision to work or not are two separate issues, underlining the conceptual distinction between the occupational choice process and career commitment.

The career-salient woman plans to consider career needs in making family decisions. The issue of in what ways family and career plans intersect to determine career salience has received the least attention from other researchers. Attempts to operationalize dimensions of attitudes towards family role allocation have depended on measures of ideology rather than the individual's own plans (e.g., Angrist and Almquist, 1975). Looking at individual plans, this study shows that college women in the sample are quite realistic about the ways in which family responsibilities might impinge on their career needs. The most career-salient women plan to choose a husband who supports their career drive, realize that they will have less time to spend with their families and to keep house because they work, expect their families to help redefine family roles to reduce home-work conflicts, and prefer an egalitarian division of marital roles. The open-ended measure of solutions to home-work conflicts is the weakest of these measures, but the data available from this study could be used to develop a more successful standardized measure.

Perhaps the most surprising finding is the strength of the relationship between the degree of marital role segregation desired and more common measures of career salience. The literature indicates there is a relationship between women working and egalitarian views about marital responsibilities, but my initial conceptualization of career salience included no necessary component of marital role sharing. Rather, I envisioned the degree of segregation desired in marital responsibilities as a good, but separate, gauge of the likelihood that career-salient women would actually be able to implement their career aspirations. While marital egalitarianism may not be a necessary component of career commitment, it certainly makes it easier. However, it is clear that, for this sample, marital role allocation is tied very closely to desires for a career. This was not true of Angrist and Almquist's (1975) college women of one college generation before. Since there are no directly comparable studies, it is difficult to determine if this is a characteristic specific to this sample or if it is indicative of a very important change in attitudes over time.

I have suggested that working-class women ought to be more realistic and aware of possible contingencies that would affect their life style plans than are more advantaged women. The consistency of the attitudes about marriage and career in this predominantly working-class sample would seem to support this hypothesis. It is clear that segregation of marital responsibilities is the rule for most of these women's parents and that, if they worked, their mothers were likely to hold two jobs. On the other hand, their greater experience with working mothers may make them more realistic in their appraisal of the optimum conditions for combining marriage and a career.

The second explanation for this strong relationship between attitudes towards marital roles and attitudes towards a career would be that there have been some real changes in outlook since the current generation of working women began their careers and since Angrist and Almquist's (1975) students graduated in 1968. Perhaps one effect of the increasing numbers of working women and of the women's movement has been to raise the consciousness of all women concerning the necessity of changing marital roles in concert with changes in patterns of work participation. Studies of other groups of women will need to be made to support the validity of this contention for the general population.

The one area of family plans that does not meet the criteria for inclusion in the career salience index is the consideration of when women plan to marry and have children and how many children they plan to have, variables that consistently are related to the actual work participation of adult women. Angrist and Almquist (1975) also tested, but were unable to include, such variables in their Life Style Index. I believe that these relationships might be stronger in a sample of the general population. For college women, the possible time range for these activities is only about ten years, if one takes into account concern with age of childbearing. Thus, the distinction in this sample is between those who would choose to marry and start their families in their early to mid-twenties, compared to those who would wait until their late twenties or early thirties. These differences may not be too significant. Only 23 women indicate they are not sure they want to marry, while 32 women are uncertain or do not want to have children. These women score consistently high on career salience. Overall, the strength of the relationships between measures of family plans and career plans does seem to support the contention that both need to be taken into consideration when measuring women's career salience and predicting their future career commitment.

Educational aspirations and dimensions of career choice do not appear to be central components of career salience. For this sample, educational aspirations and expectations are positively related to other measures of career salience, but the relationships are not strong enough to include a measure of educational plans in the index.

I would suggest that emphasis on graduate school aspirations as a definition of career salience may show a professional bias and is affected by the nature of the career aspirations of this sample. One can be career-salient and choose a variety of specific career goals. Plans for education past college are not necessary requisites to continuous participation and advancement in many occupational areas. The career aspirations of the majority of this sample are the lesser professions, public school teaching and nursing being typical examples. It is possible to obtain a job in these areas with a bachelor's degree, and, at least in nursing, it is possible to maintain continuous employment with this training. Since the career-salient do not show great interest in advancement within their chosen occupation, further educational plans may not be integral to the continued career commitment of this sample.

Several of the studies reviewed previously include educational aspirations in their definitions of career salience. For example, Angrist and Almquist (1975) include educational plans in their Life Style Index. While the career plans of their sample are not all that different in terms of status, their sample is primarily upper middle class in origin, while here we are dealing with a working class and lower middle class sample. This class background difference may explain the differential importance of further education to career salience in the two samples. For State women, obtaining a college education is a great accomplishment and insures them upward mobility compared to their parents. The relationship between educational aspirations and career salience is still strong, but it will be treated as a correlate rather than a necessary component of career salience.

In the area of career choice, only the sex stereotype dimension approaches a significant relationship with other measures of career salience, but this relationship is not strong enough to include consideration of the predominant sex of the occupation chosen as a component of career salience. The findings here, supported by the most parallel study (Angrist and Almquist, 1975), suggest that occupational preference and career salience are basically unrelated. This would seem to support my contention that the great emphasis on dimensions of occupational choice in the career education literature needs to be tempered with more consideration of the degree of commitment to work if we are to gain an understanding of the work participation of women. The fact that there is a range of degree of career salience in a sample whose occupational choices are quite homogeneous and "traditional" lends further support to this observation, as well as suggesting that some career-salient women may try to make their aberrant life style plans seem less unusual by committing themselves to traditionally female occupations.

Conclusion

The content of the final measure supports my contention that for women, the salience of career concerns is best understood within the context of general life style plans. Since career plans are contingent on other plans, one must measure the relative emphasis on a career compared to concern with family responsibilities. Occupational values, career choice, and even educational plans have less predictive utility in suggesting who will emphasize the importance of work outside the home than do measures of conceptions of family roles.

The career salience index is an attitudinal measure. It is based on measures of proposed behavior in the future based on current conceptions of work and family roles. While I would expect those women who score high on career salience to be more likely to actually be involved continuously in a career in the future, there is no way to test this assertion here. One additional finding does support the description of the index as a valid measure of current career salience. Respondents were asked whether the following statement describes a way in which they have changed since entering college: "I have become more strongly committed to having a career," with 61.7 percent of the 261 women responding indicating this is at least somewhat true of them.

This is not an ideal test item, since women who were strongly career-committed before coming to college ought to disagree, but it is the closest to a direct statement by the sample of their degree of career commitment. All the component items in the final index are strongly, positively related to the response to this item and the correlation with the career salience index is .2914 ($p < .001$).

The following chapter considers the relationships between scores on the career salience index and measures of other individual attributes of the women studied. The findings shed further light on the explanatory power of the deviance and enrichment hypotheses, as well as suggesting ways in which educators might intervene to encourage women similar to those studied to consider a career as an important source of life satisfaction.

CHAPTER V

THE RELATIONSHIP OF CAREER SALIENCE TO OTHER INDIVIDUAL ATTRIBUTES

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings concerning the relationship of career salience to other contemporaneous attributes of the subjects. The variables are presented in the order in which they were discussed in the review of the literature, with each section beginning with a restatement of the relevant hypotheses formed on the basis of that review. Operational definitions of variables are presented, followed by presentation of the results, and, finally, a discussion of the implications of the findings.

Results

College Class

1. Career salience increases over the four years of college, with the most significant increase in career interest occurring between the junior and senior years. As Table 1 in Chapter III indicates, the sample is representative of the college population's distribution by class, with the freshman and sophomore classes being somewhat larger than the junior and senior classes. In the sample, 125 women are between the ages of 17 and 19, 141 women are 20 to 22, while five women are 23 to 26. Here, I have used college class as the predictor

variable, to allow for comparison of findings with other studies that use this distinction. Almost all the women in the sample are in the appropriate class for their age group.

Table 6 reports the relationships between career salience and college class. While career salience does increase progressively over the four years, the differences among the four classes are not significant. Significant differences do appear in the comparison of freshmen to all other students, corroborating the findings of most studies that freshmen have the most "traditional" career attitudes. The difference in degree of career salience is even more marked when comparing under- and upperclass women, while the difference between seniors and all other students is not significantly large. Since the data were collected at the end of a school year, when the juniors were about to be seniors, these findings still support the hypothesis that the most dramatic increase in degree of career salience occurs between the junior and senior years, though suggesting that the junior year itself may be the pivotal point when women turn toward or away from a career.[1]

Academic Achievement and Intellectual Interests

2. Career salience is not related to actual academic achievement or ability. The data available to test this hypothesis include self-reports of high school rank, verbal and mathematics SAT scores, overall college grade point average, average in the academic major, and a

---

[1] See the discussion section of this chapter for a consideration of the other changes that occur at this pivotal point that help to explain the increase in career salience.

Table 6.--Relationship between Career Salience and College Class

	n	Mean Career Salience Score	F	d.f.	p
Freshmen	77	-.1437			
Sophomores	84	-.0309			
Juniors	54	.1111			
Seniors	56	.1547	2.8137	(3, 267)	NS
Freshmen	77	-.1437			
Other	194	.0622	5.3483	(1, 269)	<.025
Underclass women	161	-.0848			
Upperclass women	110	.1333	7.1651	(1, 269)	<.010
Seniors	56	.1547			
Other	215	-.0356	3.6627	(1, 269)	NS

self-evaluation of academic ability compared to college peers. Table 86 in Appendix 4 reports the sample distributions on the academic achievement measures. The typical student in the sample graduated in the top quarter of her high school class, scored in the 500's on the SATs, and has earned a C+ average in college, with a B average in her major. An academic achievement index composed of the mean of the standardized scores on the high school rank, verbal SAT, and overall grade point average measures, with item components weighted according to the factor score coefficients, has a mean of .0001 and a standard deviation of .3325. The mathematics SAT score is not included in the index because of the relatively low correlations with the high school and college achievement measures, and because when it is included, the amount of variance explained by the index is reduced. Still, the academic achievement index is not a strong measure, with a relatively low scale reliability coefficient.[2] There also is some indication that the self-reported achievement levels may be inflated.[3]

Keeping these cautions about the reliability of the data in mind, Table 7 reports the relationships between the measures of actual and perceived academic achievement and career salience. For this sample, there are significant relationships between degree of career salience and all measures of academic achievement, except for high school rank, with career-salient women reporting higher achievement scores. The strongest correlation is between career salience and performance in an area of special interest, the academic major. Also, career-salient women perceive themselves as more able than their college peers. For this sample, the hypothesis of no relationship between academic achievement and career salience must be rejected.

3. Career salience is higher in women with a strong need for achievement or intellectual interests. Standard need for achievement measures are not easily adaptable to a questionnaire format, so there is no direct measure of this concept here. Three questionnaire items measure related concerns.[4] Only 14 women feel that doing well in college is not important (item 82.). Comparing the 122 women

---

[2] See Table 35 and 36 in Appendix 3 for estimates of the reliability of the index.

[3] See Appendix 4 for estimates of the reliability of the academic achievement data.

[4] For additional data concerning achievement needs and intellectual interests, see the sections on values and self-concepts.

Table 7.--Relationship between Career Salience and Academic Achievement

	n	*r*	*p*
Academic achievement index	271	-.1557	<.005
High school rank	267	-.0048	NS
Verbal SAT	268	-.1881	<.001
Mathematics SAT	267	-.1524	<.006
Overall college GPA	266	-.1515	<.007
GPA in major	249	-.2123	<.001

	n	Mean Career Salience Score	*F*	d.f.	*p*
Self-rating of academic ability					
Above average	130	.1409			
Average and below	136	-.1313	11.3502	(1, 264)	<.01

NOTE: All academic achievement measures are coded so that a low score represents high achievement.

who view high achievement as very important to those who assign some or no importance to this goal, there is no difference related to degree of career salience (*r* = .0589, NS).

The respondents also were asked whether, since entering college, they had begun to enjoy learning for its own sake (item 83.j.). While this item only measures recent changes, it does give some indication of the current importance of intellectual interests. Of the 261 women who responded, 34.5 percent report that this is very true of them, 34.1 percent state that it is somewhat true, and the remainder are uncertain or feel they have not begun to enjoy learning. There is a strong correlation between career salience and current enjoyment of learning for its own sake ($\underline{r} = -.2495$, $\underline{p} < .001$), with more highly career-salient women more likely to agree.

Hanley (1974) and Horner (1969) report lower fear of success scores among career-salient women than for other women. While Horner's (1969) cue for eliciting fear of success imagery was included in the questionnaire (item 75.), I have made no attempt to code the responses according to her complex system of categories. For illustrative purposes only, the coders chose 35 responses that were particularly interesting or articulate. Among this group, most of the women express some ambivalence about a high-achieving woman like Anne, regardless of their personal degree of career salience. However, those who score in the lowest third on the career salience index have the most consistently negative views of Anne, showing great concern about her poor social life. For example, a woman who scores low on career salience says

> [Anne] studies a lot; [has] hardly any social life, if some, probably once a week: [is] introverted. [Anne feels] great because she's worked hard for it, but she wishes she could go out more and have more friends. She'll probably be very successful, but very lonely -- become an old maid.

Another woman who scores low on career salience, while basically positive about Anne's accomplishment, exemplifies a pattern identified by Horner in other samples, but atypical for this sample, that of "changing" the cue to downplay Anne's aspirations:

> [Anne is] intelligent, dedicated, respected. [She feels] superior, yet doesn't show it. [She'll] probably succeed and become a nurse or doctor. (Emphasis added)

Those scoring in the middle third on career salience share no common reaction to Anne's situation. Some are quite negative, like those in the low group. For example, one woman describes Anne as

> anti-feminist, spends all her time reading, no fun -- no boys. [Anne feels] wonderful, she beat everyone, even the males. She will probably become a great doctor, but I doubt she'll ever marry.

Another woman exemplifies those in the mid-third on career salience who generally admire Anne:

> [Anne is] proud and pleased. Anne deserves pride because she's worked so hard; [she's] humble, confident. [She's] probably aware of those "beneath" her; ambitious to keep this status. [Anne feels] fearful of being cast off by her friends; she is careful not to be boastful or outwardly "snobbish." Anne is excited to use her talents. Anne will be successful with her attitude. She has personal goals and her medical career will open several opportunities for her.

Those scoring in the highest third on the career salience index are closest to sharing Anne's career drive, and, as the data on achievement levels suggests, probably also have experienced first-hand the ramifications of academic success. We might expect them to identify more with this case example than do their peers. This group holds the most consistently positive views of Anne, though they also are ambivalent. The highly career-salient women are the only ones who indicate an awareness of the possibility that a woman in Anne's position might face discrimination. These characteristics of the responses of career-salient women are exemplified in the following comments:

> [Anne is] intelligent and not afraid to show it; dedicated and hardworking; [has a] strong, inquiring mind, the ability to integrate concepts and actions, and probably is a well-adjusted and happy person; [has] faith in herself. [She] feels proud of her achievement, perhaps wondering if she knows as much as her grades indicate, may be wondering if her male colleagues will still talk to her, perhaps wondering if they will try to use her. Hopefully she'll be able to

> go as far as her abilities will take her without being discriminated against because she is a woman.

In conclusion, the available data do not allow a good test of the relationship between need for achievement and career salience for this sample. Highly career-salient women are more likely than other women to feel that they enjoy the learning process.

Educational Aspirations

4. Career salience is positively related to educational aspirations. Table 8 reports the sample distributions on variables related to educational plans. The majority of these women would like to obtain some graduate education, although only about one-half expect they will be able to do so. Most of those who expect they will go to graduate school have rather indefinite plans about when they will go. Of those who plan to wait awhile after college before returning to school, the majority give what I have termed "intrinsic" reasons for this decision, including such motivations as "need time to evaluate programs," "want work experience before grad school," and "there are other things I want to study also that don't require grad school." The extrinsic category includes financial problems and immediate marriage plans. Women also were asked if their educational aspirations had been heightened since entering college, with about one-half feeling that they have. On the other hand, almost one-half have become more cynical about the value of an education during their college years.

Table 8.--Distribution of Responses on the Educational Plans Measures

	n	Percentage
Educational aspirations	267	
Ph.D., LL.B., M.D.		13.5
M.A.		44.9
Some graduate courses		13.1
B.A.		25.5
Some college		3.0
Educational expectations	267	
Ph.D., LL.B., M.D.		4.5
M.A.		33.7
Some graduate courses		18.0
B.A.		38.2
Some college		5.6
When plan to go to graduate school	188	
After college, full time		9.6
After college, part time		22.9
Plan to wait awhile		32.4
Not sure yet		35.1
Why wait to go to graduate school	85	
Intrinsic reasons		57.6
Extrinsic reasons		42.4
Want to continue education now	261	
Very true		29.1
Somewhat true		24.5
Uncertain how true		19.9
Not very true		10.3
Not at all true		16.1

Table 8.--Continued

	n	Percentage
More cynical about value of education now	262	
Very true		14.1
Somewhat true		32.8
Uncertain how true		15.3
Not very true		20.2
Not at all true		17.6

As predicted, there is a strong correlation between career salience and educational aspirations (r = -.3842, $p < .001$) and expectations (r = -.4287, $p < .001$), with career-salient women scoring higher on both measures. When the more strongly related expectations measure is considered as a dichotomy, comparing women with graduate school expectations (mean career salience score = .2284) to women who expect to earn a B.A. or less (mean career salience score = -.2951), the strength of the relationship is quite clear (F (1, 265) = 48.1602, $p < .01$). Career-salient women also are more likely to feel that their educational expectations have increased since entering college (r = -.3776, $p < .001$). There are no significant differences in definitiveness of graduate school plans (r = -.0929, NS), reasons for waiting to attend graduate school (F (1,83) = 1.7611, NS), or increase in cynicism about the value of an education (r = -.0931, NS), related to career salience.

Educational and Occupational Values

5. Career salience is not related to general educational and occupational values. Beliefs about the function of an education and occupational values were measured using standard value scales developed by others with a four-level Likert-style format. No standardized value scales adequately consider the importance of family concerns to educational and occupational decisions,[5] so new items to measure a family-orientation were developed based on the literature review and the pilot study. A related issue, reasons for choosing a particular college, also is considered in this section. The items used are based on the responses of the participants in the pilot study.

The educational values measure (item 20.),[6] operationalized as reasons for desiring to attend college, attempts to tap Havinghurst's (1968) dimensions of an expressive, or self-development orientation (items a., b., i., j.) and an instrumental, or extrinsic-rewards orientation (items e. and g.). It also measures degree of concern with what might be termed a family-betterment orientation (items c. and f.). The motive, "learn a skill just in case I have to work", implies a concern with the instrumental value of education as skill training, but also assumes a primary concern with family roles, with education providing potential security for the individual and her family.

---

[5] The pretest questionnaire included the "family" item used in most studies of women's educational values, "to find a husband," but no one in the pretest sample would admit to such a motivation. The occupational value family-orientation items are similar to those used by Angrist and Almquist (1975) and Simpson and Simpson (1961).

[6] Item 20.d., "to please my parents," and item 25.i, "parents wanted LSC," expressed as a reason for going to this college, were not included as value-orientation measures, but as measures of the individual's response to external pressures in making the decision to go to college and in choosing a college. Responses to these items are analyzed in Chapter VI with the other data on parental influence.

Item analysis corroborates the presence of the three-factor educational value configuration outlined above.[7] Concern with learning a skill is a separate issue, with strong correlations to both the family-betterment orientation ($\underline{r}$ = .3704, $\underline{p}<.001$) and the extrinsic-rewards orientation ($\underline{r}$ = .3606, $\underline{p}<.001$). The family-betterment orientation is about equally correlated to the self-development and extrinsic-rewards orientation, while these two value-orientations are basically unrelated. The extrinsic-rewards orientation index is not very reliable, primarily because of the poor distribution on the "good job" variable.[8] This index is not used in further analysis.

The occupational values measure (item 33.), operationalized as the importance of a series of job characteristics required for the ideal job, attempts to tap the three value-orientations identified by Rosenberg (1957): the self-expression orientation (items d., l., and o.), the people-orientation (items e., i., and m.), and the extrinsic-rewards orientation (items a., f., h., and j.). Also, several items measure these women's concern with working conditions that would facilitate combining family and career participation (items g., k., and n.). The remaining items concerning interest in nonmanual work, freedom from supervision, and responsibility were expected to be separate issues, unrelated to any underlying value-orientation theme.

---

[7] See Appendix 3, Tables 37-40 for the corroborating reliability data.

[8] See Table 9. While concern with getting a good job and prestige are significantly correlated, the undefined term "good job" allows for many varying interpretations and, thus, is a weak item. Even when this item was dichotomized to compare those who feel a good job is very important to all others, the two-item index was not reliable. Also, prestige and concern with getting a good job are related to other variables differently.

For this sample, the self-expression and people-orientation items do not differentiate among respondents, with well over 90 percent of the subjects attaching some importance to each of the relevant items and the majority feeling that these job characteristics are *very* important. From the remaining items, two general value constructs emerge:[9] an extrinsic-rewards orientation, including concern with advancement opportunities, a good salary, and prestige; and a family-orientation, measuring a concern with a job's suitability for allowing one to combine family and employment responsibilities due to reasonable hours and the opportunity to return to work after child rearing. A third item, interest in not having to take one's job home, is related to this family-orientation, but the index is strongest when it is not included. Concern with the stability and security of employment, usually viewed as an aspect of the extrinsic-rewards orientation, here links the two general value constructs, being equally related to emphasis on extrinsic-rewards ($r = .4589$, $p < .001$) and family needs ($r = .4880$, $p < .001$). As expected, the remaining concerns with aspects of working conditions, clean, nonphysical work, being one's own boss, and amount of responsibility, are unrelated to the other value-orientations.

The educational and occupational value constructs are very similar in content. Their reliability as measures of basic value-orientations is further supported by the consistency between individual respondent's values in both of these decision areas. Tables 44-46 in Appendix 3 indicate strong tendencies towards a general stress on extrinsic rewards or family concerns in educational and occupational decision making. Because of the lack of a distribution on the self-expression items in the occupational values inventory, it is not possible to adequately test for a similar generalized self-development orientation. However, desiring an opportunity to be creative, the one self-expression occupational value with some differentiation when dichotomized into categories of "very important" (65.8 percent) compared to all other levels of concern, is significantly correlated with the educational values self-development orientation index ($\underline{r} = .2681$, $\underline{p} < .001$).

---

[9] See Appendix 3, Tables 41-43 for the corroborating reliability data.

I also developed one other type of composite measure from the educational and occupational values items, based on an interesting suggestion about patterns of occupational values tested by only one previous study. Simpson and Simpson (1961) found that noncareer-salient women distinguish less among various job features, rating a greater number of attributes as important, regardless of the type of value-orientation represented. To test this hypothesis, variables were formed that represent the proportion of "very important" ratings across all educational or occupational value items.

Among the reasons cited for choosing this college (item 25.), the low cost is clearly the predominant motivation, with 91.8 percent of the 268 women responding to this item citing this factor as important. The least likely reason, viewed as important by 14.2 percent of the 260 respondents, is that this was the only college where they were accepted. Among the other listed reasons, on which sample responses were more evenly divided, two patterns emerge.[10] Women who were concerned with the quality of the school were also likely to emphasize the programs offered. Respondents also showed what I would consider a parochial tendency, choosing this school because they wanted to stay near home, it was within commuting distance, and their friends were going here. While the quality index is a good measure, the parochialism index is not as reliable, with the concern with friends' plans being the weakest component. The two areas of concern are almost completely unrelated.

Table 9 reports the sample response distributions and relationships with career salience for the individual items and indexes measuring values implemented in these three decision areas. There is almost unanimous agreement that getting a good job is an important reason for obtaining a college education, but the sample is evenly divided on the importance of the other items measuring a concern with extrinsic rewards. There is more emphasis on security and family concerns as important factors in job decisions than on the parallel educational value items. The sample as a whole places high value on the opportunities for self-development provided by an education, and on the quality of the school as a reason for choosing this college. While the great majority of the sample assigns some importance to having a lot of responsibility in their ideal job, only 21.1 percent of those responding feel this job characteristic is "very" important. The majority place some value on freedom from supervision, while only a minority are concerned with finding a "clean" job or one where responsibilities end at the end of the work day. Considering reasons for choosing this college, a minority of these women were concerned with the effect of their academic record on their possible choices, while the sample is evenly divided on the importance of staying close to home as a motivating factor.

---

[10] See Appendix 3, Tables 47-49 for the corroborating reliability data.

Contrary to the working hypothesis, there are significant relationships between educational and occupational values and degree of career salience. Highly career-salient women are more likely than other women to reject wanting to get a good job, desiring to learn a skill, and improving one's performance in family roles as reasons for desiring a college education. They also are less parochial in their reasons for choosing this particular college. In choosing the ideal job, highly career-salient women show significantly more interest than other women in being their own boss and having opportunities to be creative. On the other hand, they are significantly less interested than other students in extrinsic rewards, family-related concerns, security, not taking one's job home, and having a clean job.

While statistically significant, the cited relationships are not very strong, except for the differences in amount of emphasis on family concerns. The data lead one to reject the hypothesis of no relationship between values and career salience for this sample, and suggest that the importance of family role-related motivations best distinguishes women with varying degrees of interest in a career.

Table 9.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Value-Orientation Measures

	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage Important[a]	r	p
Educational values				
Get a good job	270	91.9[b]	.1863	<.001
Gain prestige	270	42.2	.0057	NS
Learn a skill	263	50.2	.2949	<.001
Average percent "very important" ratings	268	33.3[c]	-.0462	NS
Occupational values				
Be own boss	269	63.2	-.2010	<.001
Nonmanual work	268	37.3	.1308	<.016
Security	269	86.6[b]	.1941	<.001
Creativity	269	91.1[b]	-.1904	<.001
Not take job home	270	40.0	.2862	<.001
Responsibility	270	80.4	-.0926	NS
Average percent "very important" ratings	241	42.5[c]	-.0030	NS
Reasons for college choice				
Academic record	265	34.3	.0978	NS

Table 9.--Continued

	Response Distribution			Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Mean Index Score	Standard Deviation	r	p
Educational values					
Self-development orientation	270	1.690	.588	-.0874	NS
Family-betterment orientation	269	2.673	.954	.3587	<.001
Occupational values					
Extrinsic-rewards orientation	270	2.222	.667	.1196	<.025
Family orientation	270	2.006	.864	.4146	<.001
General value-orientations					
Extrinsic-rewards orientation	270	2.207	.629	.1224	<.022
Family orientation	271	2.340	.783	.4521	<.001
Reasons for college choice					
College quality	269	1.993	.796	.0401	NS
Parochialism	270	2.565	.841	.2960	<.001

Table 9.--Continued

NOTE: All value items are coded so that a low score represents high importance (scores range from 1 = very important to 4 = not at all important).

[a] For the original scale items, this figure represents the proportion of "important" ratings. Responses are dichotomized for descriptive purposes only. In the correlational analyses, the four levels of importance are retained for all variables with relatively normal distributions.

[b] Because of the overall high importance attached to these three value items, responses were dichotomized into categories of "very important" compared to all other responses for analysis of their relationships with career salience. The percentages of "very important" ratings are as follows: get a good job, 53.3 percent; security, 52.4 percent; creativity, 65.8 percent.

[c] This figure represents the mean percentage of "very important" ratings on all educational or occupational value items.

Career Choice and Work Experience

6. Career salience is higher among women who chose their occupational goal early in life. Respondents were asked to report their career aspirations at three points in time, in elementary school, in high school, and at present (items 17., 18., and 30.), roughly equivalent to Ginzberg et al.'s (1951) fantasy, tentative, and realistic choice stages. For the 89 women whose career aspirations were unchanged since elementary school, the mean career salience score is -.1950; for the 47 women who made their current choice in high school, the mean is -.0448; and for the 84 women who made their choice recently, the mean score is .1817. These differences are significant (F (2, 217) = 7.7575, $p < .01$), though when the career choice was made does not explain much of the variance in career salience ($eta^2 = .067$). To the degree that timing of choice explains career salience, the relationship is basically

linear (r^2 = .066), with more recent choices predicting higher career salience. A related question asked whether these women had changed their career plans drastically since entering college (item 83.b.). Only 25.9 percent of the 263 women responding felt this was at least "somewhat true" of them. Comparing these women to all others there is no significant relationship with career salience, though the direction of the correlation supports the findings for the more direct measure of timing of career choice (r = -.0999, NS). Though the data are not definitive enough to support an alternative hypothesis of a positive relationship between recency of choice and career salience, they do suggest that, for this sample, the original hypothesis favoring early choice as a precursor of career salience should be rejected.

These women also reported their most realistic occupational expectation (item 31.), allowing a test of the related issue of the relationship between career salience and current certainty of occupational choice, measured by comparing occupational aspirations and occupational expectations. Of the 256 women for whom a comparison was possible, 48.4 percent expect to obtain a job equivalent to their ideal occupational aspiration, while 51.6 percent do not expect they really will be able to find such a job. There is no differentiating pattern of degree of career salience between these two groups of women (F (1, 254) = .0703, NS).

7. Career salience is not related to the prestige level of the occupational goal among college-educated women. For this sample, there is not enough variation in the status of the occupations chosen to

reliably test this hypothesis.[11] Around 80 percent of these women consistently were attracted to the lesser professions at all times of their lives, with the remainder split evenly between the major and minor professions, except for occupational expectations, where only four percent expect to obtain a job in the major professions. The fact that there is differentiation in degree of career salience in a sample of women who aspire to occupations having similar status suggests that occupational status is not an important correlate of career salience.

8. Career salience is higher in women who choose occupations atypical for their sex. The same problem of a lack of differentiation among respondents applies to the case of the sex-typing of occupational choices and fields of study. All such choices were categorized by sex, using a sex stereotype measure developed by Feldman (1974) to categorize fields of study and the actual proportion of women in the occupation to delineate the predominant sex for occupational choices.[12] The great majority of these women, 70 to 80 percent, choose decidedly female areas on all but two of the measures of occupational aspirations and fields of study, with most of the remainder choosing "neutral" fields. For current occupational aspirations, 61.2 percent of the 260 women with a definite choice choose female-dominated fields, 23.8 percent choose fields that are somewhat less typical for women, and 15 percent choose male-dominated occupations. There is more differentiation in choice of

---

[11] See the description of the occupational status coding procedures in Appendix 2.

[12] See the description of the measures and the coding procedures used in Appendix 2.

academic major, with 49.1 percent choosing disciplines stereotyped as feminine, and 40.2 percent choosing fields stereotyped as "belonging" to neither sex, with most of this group in the social sciences. Still, very few choices, 10.7 percent, are decidedly "masculine."

Because of this lack of interest in male-dominated fields or occupations, the only possible comparison on all but the occupational aspiration measure, where the distribution is still very skewed, is between those women who choose the most "feminine" fields or occupations and all other women.[13] Using this dichotomy, there is no significant difference in career salience related to the sex-typing of the college major ($r = -.0773$, NS) or chosen graduate field (aspiration: $r = .0181$, NS; expectation: $r = .0720$, NS). However, there are significant differences in career salience based on the predominant sex in the occupation to which women aspire and the occupation in which they expect to find a job, with the more highly career-salient women more likely to choose an occupation that is not predominantly female. The analysis of the relationship with the sex-type of the occupational aspiration, where the three original categories are retained, indicates that those women who aspire to male-dominated occupations are much more career-salient than other women. The predominant sex in the occupation chosen accounts for about nine percent of the variance in career salience, with a linear increase in career salience as one moves away from the most female-dominated choices.[14] While the skewed distribution of responses affects the reliability of the statistical tests, and the sex-type measure is not one of the strongest correlates of career salience, the data do provide some support for the hypothesized positive relationship between high career salience and less traditionally feminine career choices.

---

[13] I would have liked to group respondents using the typical/atypical for women distinction used by Angrist and Almquist (1975), in which female-dominated and neutral choices are compared to male-dominated occupational choices, but the response distribution did not allow such a test.

Career salience and specific career choices. The literature provides little definitive information about the expected degree of career salience among women who choose particular fields of study or occupations. The predominant occupational aspiration of this sample, public school teaching, usually is viewed as indicative of low career salience, though, as I have pointed out, over a lifetime, teaching aspirants are very likely to work in their field.

As might be expected based on the data on the status and predominant sex of the occupations chosen, there is little variety in the occupational choices of this sample of women. Of the 261 women who have a particular occupational aspiration, 56.7 percent want to be some type of public school teacher, and 55 percent of the 220 women with a definite expectation believe they will be able to obtain a teaching job. Another 19 women would like to be college teachers, but only 8 expect to obtain such a position. Twenty-two women would like to obtain a nursing job, and all but one expect to be able to do so. The remaining choices, involving 72 women, are more individuated, though they show the pattern of clustering in the female-dominated, lesser professions.

---

[14] For occupational aspirations, mean career salience scores are -.1504 for the 159 women who choose female-dominated occupations; .0642 for the 62 women who choose occupations in the neutral category, with at least 37 percent women; and .4010 for the 39 women who choose male-dominated occupations (F (2, 257) = 12.7768, $p < .01$; $\text{eta}^2 = .090$; $r^2 = .089$). For occupational expectations, the mean career salience score for the 149 women who expect to enter female-dominated jobs is -.1222, while the 62 women whose expectations fall into the neutral or male-dominated categories score .2725 on the average (F (1, 209) = 15.7087, $p < .01$).

Comparing the public school teaching aspirants to all other women, one sees a definite tendency for those who want to be teachers to score relatively low on career salience. While the prospective teachers score -.1713, on the average, on the career salience index, their peers who make other occupational choices have an average score of .1923 ($\underline{F}$ (1, 259) = 21.2712, $\underline{p} < .01$).

I also wanted to determine if field of study is related to career salience. As reported in Chapter III, there is no significant difference in career salience when upperclass education students are compared to other upperclass women, though the relevant mean scores indicate a tendency for the education students to score lower. There also is no significant relationship between choosing a nursing major and career salience. The numbers in specific academic majors are rather small to allow for individual major comparisons.[15] Comparing women by type of major, grouped into the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences, indicates no significant differences in career salience ($\underline{F}$ (2, 268) = .4557, NS). Graduate field choices, which could best be grouped into academic disciplines (53.5 percent of aspirations, 52.7 percent of expectations), education (32.6 percent of aspirations, 31.9 percent of expectations), and "other" (13.9 percent of aspirations, 15.4 percent of expectations), show no relationship to career salience, when those who choose education are compared to all other women (aspiration: F (1, 142) = .9539, NS; expectation: F (1,89) = 2.2361, NS), or when those who choose academic disciplines are compared to those who choose practice-oriented areas of study (aspiration: F (1, 142) = .0057, NS; expectation: F (1,89) = .8369, NS).

---

[15] See Table 1, Chapter III.

9. Career salience is higher among women who have had more, and more varied work experience. Respondents were asked to list the jobs they had held over the past four years and to describe their most interesting job (items 34. and 35.). Responses to both questions were coded along several dimensions including the total number of jobs held, the status level of the jobs, the predominant sex in the most interesting job, and whether previous jobs had any relationship to the subject's current occupational aspiration. Jobs were coded as related to the current occupational interest if they were similar in type of skill, though usually with nonacademic content (e.g., guitar teacher for a teaching aspirant); if they required less skill, but had similar content or exposed the subject to the future work setting (e.g., teacher's aide or nurse's aide for teaching or nursing aspirants, respectively); or if they required less skill, had different responsibilities, but provided contact with a similar clientele (e.g., babysitting for a teaching aspirant).[16]

---

[16] The initial coding scheme retained specific information about the degree of similarity between previous jobs held and current occupational interests and the number of similar jobs, but, since relatively few respondents had related work experience, the numbers in the more specific categories are too few to allow for analysis.

Table 10 describes the job experience of these women. Only four women have not worked, while the typical student has held two or three jobs in the past four years. This is not surprising as 39.6 percent of the sample report that they pay the major portion of their college expenses. The most typical job is work as a store clerk or cashier, followed by skilled factory jobs. Although not many women have had experience in higher status jobs, those who have had such experience are somewhat more likely to describe a higher status job as their most interesting work experience. About 40 percent of those responding have had some work experience related to their current occupational interest, and most of these feel such work has been their most interesting job. Almost all of the most interesting jobs have been in female-dominated occupations.

Although there is some variety in the amount and type of job experience obtained by this sample, none of these dimensions of work experience differentiate degree of career salience.[17] For this group, the hypothesis of a positive relationship between more work experience and high career salience must be rejected, while support is provided for the finding of no relationship in the one contradictory study in the literature (Parker, 1966). The data also do not support my hypothesis that the type of work experience might affect career salience.

---

[17] Number of jobs: $r = .0872$; relationship of jobs to current interest: $r = -.0144$; average status of jobs: $r = .0085$; relationship of most interesting job to current interest: $r = .0485$; status of most interesting job: $r = -.0556$. All correlations are insignificant.

Table 10.--Distribution of Responses Concerning the Nature of Previous Work Experience

	n	Percentage
All jobs held		
Number[a]	266	
None		1.5
One		16.1
Two		32.0
Three		32.0
Four or more		18.4
Modal occupational status [a, b]	262	
Lesser, minor professional		8.8
Clerical, sales, technician		39.3
Skilled manual		33.6
Semi-skilled, unskilled		18.3
Relationship to occupational aspiration[b]	263	
No similarity		60.5
Some similarity		39.5
Most interesting job		
No job interesting	262	15.6
Occupational status[a]	221	
Lesser, minor professional		26.7
Clerical, sales, technician		42.1
Skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled		31.2
Relationship to occupational aspiration	221	
No similarity		62.4
Some similarity		37.6
Predominant sex is female	221	88.2

Table 10.--Continued

[a] Responses are grouped for descriptive purposes only. The actual number of jobs or occupational status level was used in analysis.

[b] Some responses were not clear enough to allow coding for occupational status or relationship to current occupational interest.

Sex Role Attitudes

10. Career salience is higher in women with egalitarian sex role attitudes. Much of the information elicited by the questionnaire has some content related to the measurement of sex role attitudes.[18] Here, I will consider the measures of sex role ideology, what behavior the subjects view as appropriate for men and women in general. Also, I will consider one aspect of the subjects' own behavior that is indicative of their sex role attitudes, amount of participation in the women's liberation movement.

Two item inventories measure sex role ideology. The first (item 79.) includes a series of items that emphasize a traditional view of marital roles.[19] Ten of these items form a reliable index,[20] which measures marital role ideology.[21] Those items in question 79. that do not meet the tests for index inclusion generally were included to measure other aspects of sex role attitudes.[22] The fact that these items are not as highly correlated to beliefs about marital roles as such beliefs are related to each other suggests that the strong relationships are "real" rather than a result of response set, and validates the content of the index as a measure of marital role ideology.[23]

---

[18] See for example, the components of the career salience measure described in Chapter IV; the data on attitudes towards family roles described in the following section in this chapter; and the admired qualities of men and women, and roles enacted in relationships with male peers described in Chapter VI.

[19] The items are based on those developed by Hoffman (1960), Haavio-Mannila (1967) and Gaskell (1973). Hoffman's entire sex role ideology scale has been used extensively by other researchers. I feel that this scale is unnecessarily repetitious. Hoffman's measures of male dominance ideology seem to be outdated, or, at least lack the necessary subtlety. The pretest sample consistently scoffed at some items (e.g., a wife's taking her husband's advice about voting) and complained about too much similarity among items, so a number of the commonly used items were dropped.

[20] See Appendix 3, Tables 50 and 51 for the corroborating data.

---

[21] Gaskell (1973) points out that the label of the Hoffman (1960) sex role ideology scale is misleading as the items really only measure one aspect of sex role ideology, beliefs about the division of labor in the home. Gaskell factored her items into two sets, beliefs about the normative division of labor and power relations between husband and wife, the latter index being similar to Hoffman's male dominance ideology scale. Here, only one factor is apparent, although items d. and j. clearly have content relevant to dominance issues. Several of the Hoffman items that were deleted because few in the pretest sample agreed load on Gaskell's power dimension. It may be that if less outdated power-related items had been included, two dimensions of marital role ideology would be apparent, though I still would expect beliefs about these issues to be strongly correlated.

[22] Several exceptions to the expected patterns should be noted. Items c. and h. were included as corollaries, measuring beliefs about the different sources of life satisfaction for men and women. The sample as a whole is less likely to approve of a husband's focussing on his career (24.8 percent agree), than they are to see a wife's crucial responsibility to be her family (55 percent agree). Although the item-to-item correlations are not strong enough to include the item concerning men's careers in the index, it is significantly related to the final index score ($\underline{r} = .2816$, $\underline{p} < .001$), with women who believe in segregated marital roles more likely to feel that a man should focus on his career.

Items a. and k., which contrast two views of the best way a wife can support her husband in his work, were included to operationalize theories about social class differences in ideas about the appropriate degree of integration between the home and work worlds (Komarovsky, 1967). The "segregated," working class alternative, helping by providing a comfortable home environment, is strongly related to support of segregation of marital roles, while the "integrated," middle-class response, helping by finding out about his work, is unrelated to other marital role ideology items. I also should note that these items do not differentiate among women from different social class backgrounds (Item a. and family SES index: $\underline{r} = .0175$, NS; item k. and family SES index: $\underline{r} = .0696$, NS).

Item e., concerning socialization for wife roles, which has less face validity than the other index items, is strongly related to items describing more obvious contrasts between the duties of husband and wife. It would seem that the important factor is that marital duties are emphasized.

The second aspect of sex role ideology measured concerns the subjects' evaluations of various demands for changes in male and female roles posed by the contemporary women's movement (item 84.).[24] Eleven of the 15 original items form a reliable index of feminist attitudes.[25] Almost everyone agrees that women should receive equal pay for equal work and that birth control information should be available to all women (98.5 percent and 93.2 percent some agreement, respectively).[26] Equal rights and duties for men and women in marriage also are generally accepted (87.9 percent some agreement), and this belief is only weakly related to positions on the other feminist demands. It appears that

---

[23] It is interesting to note that there seems to be more certainty concerning the appropriate division of household tasks than there is concerning responsibilities related to employment outside the home. The weakest items in the marital role ideology index are those concerning the wife's employment (items d. and i.).

[24] These items are adapted from the inventory developed by Gaskell (1973), which she refers to as the Women's Liberation Scale (WL), and later as the Attitude towards Change scale (1975). The items are based on a review of the women's movement literature by Gaskell, corroborated by the author's own review.

[25] See Tables 52 and 53 in Appendix 3 for the corroborating data.

[26] The amount of support for birth control is somewhat surprising since this is a predominantly Catholic sample. However, Greeley (1977) recently has reported data that indicate that Catholics do not listen to the church on this issue.

"equal" rights may mean different things to different people.[27] The item concerning the legalization of abortion elicited most complex response patterns, unrelated to other sex role attitudes. The abortion issue brings out many different emotions unrelated to the issue of egalitarianism, perhaps particularly in a Catholic sample.[28]

The distributions on the remaining items that form the feminist attitudes index indicate that some demands definitely are viewed as more "extreme" than others, and the factor and correlation matrices indicate that some scale components are weak links. However, in general, those who will accept the most "extreme" demands (e.g., abolishing marriage) will accept all other demands as well.[29] The complex relationships among the individual items make a single dimension the best estimate of underlying feminist attitudes.

---

[27] Those who profess a belief in equal rights in response to this item do tend to disagree with the segregated role emphasis in the marital role ideology index (r = -.3999, p$<$.001). This relationship is particularly strong when those who feel a change in the direction of more marital egalitarianism is "very" important are compared to all other women (r = -.4220, p$<$.001).

[28] Gaskell's (1973) findings were identical, with the same items deleted from the final version of the WL scale.

[29] This pattern suggested that the items might form a reliable Guttman scale. Because a number of the response distributions were similar, it was not possible to include all the items in scalogram analysis. Items b., f., j., and n., which seemed to best represent the patterns of response on all items, were tested as a Guttman scale, with the results suggesting that the scale is reliable (coefficient of reproducibility = .8916, coefficient of scalability = .6358). Since the feminist attitudes index that includes all the items is reliable, and use of the Guttman scale would require deleting a number of items, I chose to use the former scale in analysis.

Scores on the marital role ideology index and the feminist attitudes index are significantly, strongly, negatively correlated ($r = .6694$, $p < .001$). However, the two groups of items did load on separate factors when grouped for factor analysis, indicating that the two indexes measure different dimensions of sex role ideology.

While the feminist attitudes inventory did not mention the women's movement specifically, question 85.b. elicited free responses concerning the subjects' opinions of the movement, which were coded according to whether the evaluation was basically positive, equivocal, or negative.[30] Respondents also were asked to what degree they had participated in the women's liberation movement. There was little active involvement among these women. As dichotomized for analysis, women who stated they had had no involvement and those who only talked about the women's movement with their friends are compared to women who have experienced any direct exposure to the movement, ranging from reading books to demonstrating. Of the 115 women who were scored as having some involvement, 71.3 percent had only read books or attended lectures. Only 13 women had been actively involved in the women's movement.

Given the lack of direct involvement in the women's movement characteristic of this group of women, the strength of the relationships between exposure to the movement and evaluation of the movement and the other measures of sex role ideology is quite remarkable. Strong agreement on the marital role ideology index is significantly correlated with more negative evaluations of the women's movement and no exposure to the movement, and agreement with feminist demands is strongly related to more positive evaluations of and some exposure to the movement. In fact, the tone of the evaluation of the women's movement explains 23 percent of the variance in scores on the marital role ideology index and 41 percent of the variance in scores on the feminist attitudes index, with the relationships being almost completely linear.[31] Direct exposure to the women's movement and one's evaluation of the movement also are strongly related, and, although each seems to affect the other, the positive relationship between some exposure to and a positive evaluation of the movement is strongest when the evaluation dimension is considered the dependent variable.[32]

---

[30] See Appendix 2 for information about coding procedures and coding reliability.

Table 11 summarizes the sample response distributions for these measures of sex role attitudes, as well as describing their relationships with career salience. The opinions of the sample are well-distributed on almost all the measures of sex role attitudes, indicative of a wide range of attitudes with no "liberal" or "conservative" pattern characteristic of these women.

---

[31] Mean scores on the marital role ideology index (high score = disagreement): Evaluation of the women's movement: Positive = 3.6982, equivocal = 3.1551, negative = 2.6642; $\underline{F}$ (2, 248) = 37.6382, $\underline{p} < .01$; $eta^2 = .2329$, $\underline{r^2} = .2327$. Exposure to the women's movement: None = 2.8312, some = 3.4802; $\underline{F}$ (1, 255) = 39.9446, $\underline{p} < .01$.

Mean scores on the feminist attitudes index (high score = disagreement): Evaluation of the women's movement: Positive: 2.1845, equivocal = 2.7889, negative = 3.4305; $\underline{F}$ (2, 250) = 86.9980, $\underline{p} < .01$; $eta^2 = .4104$, $\underline{r^2} = .4103$. Exposure to the women's movement: None = 3.1327, some = 2.4997; $\underline{F}$ (1, 257) = 47.2614, $\underline{p} < .01$.

[32] Chi-square (2) = 40.995, $\underline{p} < .00001$; $tau_c = -.4267$, $\underline{p} < .00001$; Somer's D (asymmetric) = -.4267 with evaluation of movement dependent, = -.3224 with exposure to movement dependent.

Table 11.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Sex Role Attitude Measures

	Response Distribution			Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage		r	p
Help husband by knowing about his job--agree[a]	261	69.0		.1622	<.004
Man's major satisfaction from career--agree[a]	262	24.8		.0804	NS
Equal rights and duties in marriage--agree strongly	265	58.9		-.2883	<.001
Abortions legal, personal decision--agree strongly	263	52.5		-.1440	<.010
	n	Mean Index Score	Standard Deviation	r	p
Marital role ideology index	263	3.122	.877	.7493	<.001
Feminist attitudes index	265	2.859	.801	-.5686	<.001

Table 11.--Continued

	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience		
	n	Mean Career Salience Score	F	d.f.	p
Evaluation of women's movement[b]					
Positive	75	.3062			
Equivocal	80	.0211			
Negative	99	-.2377	15.7960	(2, 251)	<.010
Direct exposure to women's movement					
None	146	-.2176			
Some	115	.2629	37.8737	(1, 259)	<.010

NOTE: Items from the marital role ideology and feminist attitudes inventories have codes ranging from 1 = strong agreement to 5 = strong disagreement.

[a] Responses are grouped for descriptive purposes only. In the analyses, all codes are retained.

[b] Eta^2 = .1118, r^2 = .1117.

More highly career-salient women are significantly more liberal or egalitarian on all the measures of sex role ideology[33] and show a strong tendency to evaluate the women's movement positively, as might be expected since they also have had significantly more exposure to the movement. The career-salient women's reaction against the segregated marital responsibilities emphasized in the marital role ideology index is stronger than their attraction to feminist demands. Again, the abortion item, with its many connotations, shows the weakest relationship with career salience. These data provide strong support for the hypothesis of a positive relationship between egalitarian sex role attitudes and high career salience, and suggest that, since the career salience index includes measures of personal sex role conceptions, these women are quite consistent in their ideological commitments and their prospective personal behavior.

---

[33] The only exception is the lack of a relationship between degree of career salience and reaction to the item that states that men gain their greatest satisfaction from their careers. This assertion seems to threaten women with a strong family-orientation, as well as having a negative connotation for women who feel that *women and men* should see a career as an area of personal satisfaction.

Reactions to a series of case situations (item 75. through 78.) and the specific content of opinions of the women's liberation movement provide additional illustrative information relevant to measuring the consistency of these women's sex role attitudes. The hypothetical cases[34] place specific "others" in dilemmas related to sex role enactment. My assumption is that, to some extent, the respondents place themselves in the positions of the individuals described, and thus respond as they would behave in a similar situation. The cases allow introduction of some types of contingent individual circumstances that make implementing ideological commitments so difficult in real life. Dealing with specific situations and individuals, they are one step closer to the respondent's own role-conception than are the attitudes towards the appropriate behavior for men and women in general measured by the feminist attitudes and marital role ideology indexes.

---

[34] Examples of responses to items 76. and 78. will be presented here. See some examples of responses to item 75., concerning Anne the medical student, in the previous section on need for achievement. The dating situation, item 77., is considered in Chapter VI with the other data on the effects of male peers.

Item 78. tests how far these women are willing to go in supporting equal pay for equal work, presenting what in real life is an uncommon, though possible, situation where the woman who is receiving less pay does not need the money as much as the man does. Of the 252 women responding, 87.3 percent would give Mrs. Johnson the raise, approximating the proportion of respondents who indicated strong agreement with the equal pay item in the feminist attitudes inventory (88.7 percent). However, the majority of those who would give her the raise (63.6 percent) were unwilling to assume that Mrs. Johnson was doing the same work, stating that if the work was equal the pay should be the same, some suggesting rigorous standards for determining equality of work. Two women express a sex-related concern, including the highly career-salient woman who added the qualifier "assuming that the manager has not made her job easier than Mr. Brown's because she is a woman, she should be paid equal wages for equal work." Another 13.2 percent of those who would give Mrs. Johnson the raise avoided the sex discrimination issue and gave no reason for their solution. All of the 28 women who would not give Mrs. Johnson the raise score in the lowest third on career salience. The most common reason given is that Mr. Brown has greater financial responsibilities, indicative of a very different value system based on pay according to need rather than the predominant concern with pay according to worth. For example, one woman states:

> He should explain that Mr. Brown makes more money because he needs more money (for rather obvious reasons), and Mrs. Johnson, then doesn't need more money. She is a rather self-centered and hard-hearted person if she doesn't understand this.

Another woman shows knowledge of how the work world operates in her atypical suggestion that the store manager "should explain to her his situation and his needs and the store manager should give him some kind of title."

Responses to item 76., a dilemma concerning the division of responsibility for household tasks when both partners work, were much more varied and equivocating. Over half of the respondents could not decide on one solution, so two responses were coded per subject. Of the 261 respondents, over three-quarters suggested some solution that would result in Margo doing the dishes, the most common reasons given being that this would avoid an argument, would show she is unselfish or considerate, or because doing the dishes is the wife's job. An example of the latter reasoning is the response of a woman who scores in the middle third on career salience:

> Margo should do the dishes because I feel that once a woman becomes married her first responsibilities are to her husband. If he's had a hard day at the office, he should be made comfortable at home and be able to relax and not be made to do more work. If it's too much for Margo, she should quit her job or get a divorce.

The women in the highest third on career salience are as likely as other women to resolve the impasse by having Margo do the dishes, but they are more likely to emphasize that Margo must choose this solution and that Al has no right to assume she will do the work. For example, one of these women suggests:

> If the dirty dishes really bother her, she should do them. If they do not bother her, she should leave them in the sink. Dirty dishes are not sufficient reason for a disagreement. If the dirty dishes in the sink bother Al, he should do them. Under no circumstances does he have the right to insist Margo do them. Whoever does them should do so graciously.

Very few of the respondents, 13 percent, suggest a solution that results in Al's doing the dishes, and most of these also suggest that Margo ought to consider doing the work. For example, one highly career-salient women decides that:

> Depending on what kind of guy Al is, she should do them if he would (without complaint) do the same for her sometime when she was beat (and that doesn't mean when she's on her deathbed!). Otherwise, Margo should calmly explain she will not do the dishes and they can sit there 'til he finally decides he's rested up enough.

A more common solution, suggested by 37 percent of the sample is that they should do the dishes together, with most indicating that Al can help Margo. Another 32 percent provide no solution to the immediate problem, suggesting that the dishes can be left undone or are unimportant, but not explaining how or by whom they will be washed eventually. Three women avoid the marital role dilemma by suggesting that they should get a dishwasher or the children should do them.

The responses to the question concerning one's opinion of the women's liberation movement are the most complex and detailed answers elicited by any of the open-ended questions. Clearly, although the sample has had little direct involvement with the women's movement, the movement and the issues it has raised are of great interest to most of these women. With two themes coded per respondent,[35] the most common type of opinion, shared by 50% of the 226 women responding, is to indicate agreement with some of the goals of the movement and disagreement with others, with most of these women supporting the more moderate goals, such as equal pay and access to all jobs regardless of sex; but rejecting what they see as extreme positions, such as the concept that women are oppressed; frivolous issues, such as going without a bra or gaining entrance to men's bars; or extreme groups, such as "radicals" or lesbians.[36] One-quarter of these women, while basically agreeing with movement goals, negatively evaluate the means used to reach these goals, expressed either as negative feelings about the methods used by the contemporary movement or as a rejection of the idea that any movement, group, or political activity is necessary for women to attain equal rights. Another sizable group, 21 percent of those responding, indicates that they are happy with the feminine role, with the most emphasis on a desire to retain the perquisites of being treated like a lady, or the belief that women are not oppressed. A related, fairly common theme expressed by 19 percent of the respondents is that women and men are equal, but different, with differing, but important responsibilities and roles. Included in this group are women who feel that the women's movement threatens their strong belief that a woman's place is in the home, or who feel that the result of the women's movement reaching its goals will be an unattractive, unisex society. Another 18 percent emphasize that individual choice for everyone should be the central goal of the women's movement, either showing concern that the women's movement may be tending to dictate another set of roles that women must fill, or articulating a belief that both women and men need to be "liberated", that the women's movement is the first step towards "people liberation." Fourteen percent of the respondents give an opinion representing fairly unqualified support for the women's movement as an important, positive step, usually citing specific goals that they consider significant.

---

[35] See the explanation of the coding procedures used and estimates of coding reliability in Appendix 2.

[36] The demands considered acceptable or extreme in the responses to this open-ended question closely match the relative degree of agreement for the various changes listed in the feminist attitudes inventory. In fact, it appears that some women used the inventory as their "outline" in deciding what issues they would discuss in their opinion of the women's movement. Thus, in some cases, the previous fixed-alternative question "contaminated" responses concerning the women's movement, affecting the particular issues discussed, and providing an opportunity to amplify on the opinions expressed. However, the emphasis on such movement "goals" as bra-burning or gaining entry to men's bars, or the concern with lesbianism, can only be explained by the emphasis given these facets of the movement in the media, which, given the lack of direct exposure to the movement described by these women, probably is their main source of information. As explained in Appendix 2, initially an attempt was made to judge responses according to the level of understanding or amount of information about the women's movement expressed. Although the nature of the responses led us to judge the knowledge level as unclear in the majority of cases, and intercoder agreement was not complete, 34 women were judged as exhibiting stereotypic thinking or being quite misinformed about the goals of the women's movement.

In a sample of 48 responses that the coders felt were particularly interesting or exemplary, thematic patterns related to career salience emerge. Those scoring in the lowest third on career salience tend to reject the notion that women are oppressed and to support the diversity they feel is promoted by differences in sex roles. For example, one woman explains:

> Women today have more privileges than they have ever had, in other words, I don't feel as many other women don't feel, oppressed! I believe in some things they are fighting for such as equal work (except in such cases as Mrs. Johnson's. who doesn't need to work, again in my opinion). Women equal to men -- think about it -- a unisex society is actually a funny, stupid situation and I hope it never goes this far!

Another women who scores low on the career salience index emphasizes the importance of the mother role:

> I'm against it, except as far as it concerns equal pay, because I feel a woman's main concern is her home and family. Children need the loving presence of a mother, and I think most women who love their children would say that they need their children too. I see no reason for a woman to be out running around, to the neglect of her home. Anyway, most of the girls I know don't feel oppressed, nor does my mother, and I simply am against it, for myself. I wouldn't insist that anyone agree with me or anything.

The women who fall into the middle-third on the career salience index tend to choose the "agree with some goals, disagree with others" theme more than do other women. Their responses also include some of the most negative or stereotypic opinions. For example, one of these women characterizes women's movement members as follows:

> Some of their points are valid (equal pay, etc.), but it is my experience that most of these liberated chicks are so busy running around with their boobs flapping and opening their own doors that they forget the real meaning of liberation.

Another woman in this group, using less dramatic language, sees both good and bad points:

> I'm afraid I'm not a strong advocate, therefore my information and resources are limited. In a working situation, I believe women are entitled to every glory, and pressure of the job, but also deserve equal salary. I am not the type of person who strongly believes in the radical side of Women's Lib movement. I enjoy being "pampered" and enjoy returning it. I enjoy the thought of marriage even with the knowledge that it won't all be enjoyment. Yet, I want recognition of my

> rights as a human being, and women's lib has this meaning for me. Physically, I believe in more liberation. Accessable knowledge of birth control, alone, would "free" women considerably.

The women who are the most strongly career-salient are generally positive in their evaluations of the women's movement and are almost the only women who emphasize concern with individual choice or who show cognizance of the fact that sex roles limit men as well as women. The few women who indicate that the women's movement has had a positive effect on their own lives also fall into this group. One of these women exemplifies the concern that the women's movement may be forgetting the goal of freedom of choice:

> The idea is right, but I think that sometimes the extremists are just as narrow-minded as those who hate the women's libbers. I get the impression WLM believes that every woman should be a carpenter or a plumber. I could dig it, but not every woman could. Some women legitimately want to be wives and mothers, yet if they are, WLM puts them down for doing the very thing they're preaching -- freedom of choice . . . .

Another strongly career-salient women makes an articulate statement in favor of sexual equality in response to this question:

> I believe in the basic concept that all people, men and women, should be free to choose their own lifestyles. Sex should not determine roles or character traits. Nothing should be assumed about a person's personality because of their sex. . . .
>
> I think that if organizations such as women's liberation could make people recognize their rights to choose what to do with their own lives, be it housewife, doctor, or whatever, that will be true liberation. For everyone to choose their own style of life would be great.

Overall, the case material and opinions of the women's movement support the reliability of responses to the fixed-alternative questions, and provide further support for the hypothesis that high career salience is related to egalitarian sex role attitudes. However, it also is clear that ideological commitment does not always match behavior in real life situations, with the most confusion among these women remaining the area of family roles.

Family Plans and Attitudes towards Family Roles

11. Career salience is higher in women who plan to delay marriage.

12. Career salience is higher in women who plan to delay childbearing.

13. Career salience is higher in women who plan to have small families.

14. Career salience is higher in women who prefer an egalitarian division of roles in their own marriage. As hypothesized, several aspects of future family plans, including the relative importance of home-based activities, solutions to home-work conflicts, and proposed division of marital roles are definitive components of career salience. Additional data corroborate the pattern of family plans being supportive of career decisions.

Almost all the women in the sample want to marry (85.6 percent), and an additional 16 women already are married. Only 11 women definitely do not want to marry, with the remainder being unsure. The proportions who want to have children are very similar, with 88.1 percent definitely wanting to have children, 4.4 percent being undecided, and slightly more women, 20 or 7.4 percent, choosing not to have children.

Although those women who do not plan to marry or have children score consistently high on career salience, this clearly is not a typical solution to potential role conflict. As Table 12 indicates, more differentiation appears concerning the issues of the importance of marriage and parenthood, the timing of entrance into these roles, and the number of children desired. The sample as a whole is quite evenly divided as to the importance of marriage,and would be even more disappointed if they could not have children than if they did not marry. The typical respondent would like to marry in the first few years after college, begin to have children in her mid- to late-twenties, and have two or three children.

All these decisions are strongly related to career salience, with highly career-salient women more likely to attach less importance to marriage and having children, to choose to marry and have children later, and to choose to have fewer children. The differentiation is particularly strong in the case of the importance placed on marriage. It also is interesting to note that it is the women who plan marriage right after college who are the least career-salient, significantly less so than those who did marry or would like to marry during college, as well as than those who plan marriage in their late twenties.

There also is a strong,negative relationship between career salience and a woman's feeling that, since entering college, she has become more concerned with marriage plans than with career plans (item 83.k.). While few of these women feel this change in interest is descriptive of them (e.g., only 18 women respond that this is "very true), those who say this is not at all true are significantly more likely to be strongly career-salient than those who ascribe some truth to this description.

Table 12.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Family Plans Measures

	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience		
	n	Mean Career Salience Score	F	d.f.	p
Importance of marriage					
Extremely	64	-.3061			
Very	63	-.3414			
Quite	76	.2016			
Not very	46	.4684	24.8380[a]	(3, 245)	<.010
Age want to marry					
21 or below	61	-.1096			
22 - 24	124	-.1903			
25 or above	60	.2832	12.2414[b]	(2, 242)	<.010
Disappointed if no children					
Extremely	82	-.2814			
Very	74	-.0633			
Quite	58	-.0108			
Not very	37	.4189	11.2728[c]	(3, 247)	<.010
Age want to have children					
24 or below	73	-.3334			
25 or above	160	.0371	18.0060	(1, 231)	<.010
Number of children want					
One to three	164	.0112			
Four or more	75	-.2770	10.9786	(1, 237)	<.010

Table 12.--Continued

	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience		
	n	Mean Career Salience Score	F	d.f.	p
More concerned with marriage plans than with career plans					
Somewhat true	153	-.2537			
Not at all true	111	.3561	65.9241	(1, 262)	<.010
Feels may have to work					
Yes	228	.0134			
No	36	-.0474	.2538	(1, 262)	NS
Reasons may have to work					
Financial	194	-.0953			
Personal need	42	.5222	33.9966	(1, 234)	<.010
	n	Percentage		r	p
Number of reasons may have to work	264			.0337	NS
None		13.6			
One		32.6			
Two		28.0			
Three		16.7			
Four or more		9.1			

Table 12.--Continued

	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage	r	p
Husband's qualities[d]				
Good looking--important	262	52.7	.2775	<.001
Professional job--important	261	68.2	.0485	NS
Sensitive--very important	262	63.0	-.1756	<.002
Ambitious--very important	262	56.1	.0449	NS
Similar interests--very important	262	51.1	.0757	NS
Good provider -- very important	259	54.8	.3679	<.001
Dominating--important	258	45.0	.2942	<.001
College-educated--important	258	64.7	-.1645	<.004
Important activities[d]				
Hobbies, personal activities--yes	244	45.1	-.1195	<.031
Contributing to community--yes	244	42.2	.0337	NS

Table 12.--Continued

[a] $\text{Eta}^2 = .2332$, $r^2 = .2000$.

[b] $\text{Eta}^2 = .0919$, $r^2 = .0455$.

[c] $\text{Eta}^2 = .1204$, $r^2 = .1076$.

[d] Responses are coded so that a low value represents the opinion that the item is important.

No study has considered the issue of whether career-salient women consciously look for members of their role network who are different in some ways that might be supportive of their career interests or indicative of their companionate marital role conceptions. As one way of approaching this issue, I attempted to determine what qualities would be important to these women in choosing their future husband (item 43b.). Concern that a husband support his wife's career interests is one of the definitive components of the career salience index used here. The other listed qualities were not very successful in differentiating among respondents, nor were there any consistent patterns that would allow for grouping of the individual items according to underlying themes. In order to determine if individual items show any relationship to career salience, the item responses were dichotomized into categories of very important versus some importance or less, and some importance versus no importance, depending on the sample response distribution on the individual item. As Table 12 indicates, based on these distinctions, career-salient women place less emphasis than other women on their future husband's looks, on whether he will be a good provider, and on whether he is dominating, and show somewhat more concern than other women that their husband be sensitive and college-educated.

Table 12 also summarizes additional data about future life style plans not directly related to family issues. Along with the family and career-related responses included in the career salience index, item 46. offered other alternative activities that might be important sources of satisfaction in a woman's adult life. Only 14.6 percent of the 244 women who chose three activities included clubs and volunteer work as important activities, while only 20.5 percent chose contributing to the financial support of their families. The sample is quite evenly split on the importance of making a contribution to the community and on wanting to spend time on hobbies, sports, and other personal interests. The latter response is more typical of strongly career-salient women, though the relationship is not strong.

Also, these women were asked whether they felt they would ever have to work and, if so, why (item 40.). Only 36 women could foresee no situation that would necessitate their working, while most listed about two reasons they might have to work. The great majority of the situations cited had to do with financial necessity, such as working for self-support if one doesn't marry, or a husband's being out of work, ill or dying. Only 42 women cited nonfinancial reasons related to personal needs (e.g., "to avoid stagnation," "to be a whole person," "I have a responsibility to use my talents to help others," "I need to have some kind of work), or beliefs in marital role sharing (e.g., "both husband and wife should work," "want to alternate working with my husband so both can pursue other interests, rest.").

As Table 12 indicates, there are no significant relationships between the number of reasons cited or whether a woman feels she might have to work and career salience. On the other hand, although few women offer nonfinancial reasons for having to work, those who do are consistently career-salient.

These data support the stated hypotheses concerning the relationships between career salience and marriage and parenthood plans, and suggest that differences in the values implemented through mate selection may be another avenue worthy of further exploration. The findings also provide corroboration for my contention that career and family plans are intertwined in the decisions of young women.

Self-Concept and Personality

15. Career salience is higher in women with positive self-concepts.

16. Career salience is higher in women who describe themselves in terms stereotyped as masculine. Two types of measures are available to test these hypotheses and to delineate other aspects of self-definition that may distinguish among women who vary in degree of career salience in this study sample. Subjects were asked to describe themselves, using a version of the "Who Am I?" technique (item 41.), and to complete a closed-ended personality inventory (item 74.), which measures specific aspects of behavior and self-attitudes.

As explored in more detail in Chapter II, I am defining the self-concept as the composite of thoughts and feelings that constitute a person's awareness of her individual existence, her concept of who or what she is. Operationally, self-concept is defined as how a person describes herself. "I am . . ." measures the current self-concept, "I will be . . ." measures the realistic future self, and "Ideally, I would like to be . . ." measures the most ideal self-concept. The variant of the "Who Am I?" method used here assumes that when presented with the stimulus phrase, a person makes a quick inventory of the components of her self-system and reports those components that are most salient at this point in time (Young, 1972). The crucial operating assumption on which this technique is based is that scientifically important parts of the self-concept are available to awareness and can be put into words. Such self-reports must be interpreted as evidence of a state of being at a particular time, not as irreversible personality trends (McPartland et al., 1961).

This technique has the advantage of being open-ended, theoretically offering subjects the opportunity for the full expression of their individual selves without the content being limited by the researcher. However, we know that people's willingness to disclose their private selves varies with different content areas of disclosure (Jourard and Lasakow, 1955); that people tend to identify themselves in terms of attributes on which they see themselves favorably (Wellman, 1969); and that, when open-ended measures are used, subjects often fail to mention characteristics that other techniques indicate are important parts of their self-conception (Wylie, 1961).

In spite of these problems, I chose to use the open-ended "Who Am I?" question as my primary measure because I feel it best allows for the expression of the individualistic nature of the self-concept. I reviewed the available forced-choice and rating scale measures of the self-concept, but rejected them because there is no way to tell the extent to which the external limits imposed by the measuring instrument prevent the subject from giving an accurate report of her conscious cognitions and feelings. Various forms of the "Who Am I?" technique have been tested extensively, and, although the validity of such a measure is difficult to ascertain, those researchers who have attempted to do so conclude that the "Who Am I?" method is superior to other available self-concept measures (McLaughlin, 1965, 1966; Strong and Feder, 1961).[37]

A major problem with using such an open-ended method is the development of accurate and inclusive methods for response categorization. The development and testing of the coding scheme used here are described in Appendix 2. Although the self-concept measures were coded on more specific dimensions as well, in this report I will consider only the two general dimensions that are most relevant to testing the hypotheses stated above: evaluative tone, defined as the social desirability of characteristics for an adult member of American society; and sex stereotype, defined as consensual beliefs about the differing characteristics of adult men and women.

---

[37] The version of the "Who Am I?" technique used here is somewhat different from the classic Twenty Statements Test developed initially by Kuhn and McPartland (1954). The three cues used predetermine the "tenses of the self," which Gordon (1968) has argued are important differentiating factors in understanding people's self-conceptions. Since I primarily was interested in the content of self-descriptions rather than their form of expression, and because I wanted to have some measure of self-ideal discrepancies, I chose to constrain free expression by specifying the verb stem. Second, subjects gave only five responses to each cue, rather than the common 15 to 20 responses. This restriction was made because of the length of the questionnaire and because I used several such measures (also see item 47.) and did not feel respondents would be willing or able to complete several lengthy lists. Requesting fewer descriptions invalidates the common procedure of using order of presentation as a measure of the relative importance of various self-descriptions. Also, some researchers would argue that such a short list will not uncover the more "defended" aspects of the self-concept (for example, see Gordon, 1968).

Table 13 summarizes the distribution of responses to the self-concept items on these two dimensions. As expected, the majority of the responses are positive descriptions, although the current self-descriptions include a sizable negative component. There are few self-descriptions that are decidedly masculine, though it is interesting to note that, for the sample as a whole, the "ideal self" would be more masculine. For this sample, the most common types of responses are adjectival descriptions of attributes, with "feminine" affiliative and emotional qualities cited more often.[38]

I also measured self-ideal discrepancies on these self-concept dimensions. Some researchers have suggested that the discrepancy between the current and ideal self-concepts is a good measure of personal adjustment (Turner and Vanderlippe, 1958) or self-esteem (Butler and Haigh, 1954; Richardson, 1975; Silber and Tippett, 1965). I would not go so far as to suggest that such a discrepancy is a good measure of adjustment, especially because, as

---

[38] Because relatively few of the responses to the "Who Am I?" questions and the other items that use this coding scheme (see Appendix 2) were negative or masculine, and in order to treat these nominal categories as interval measures, the responses were dichotomized for analysis into categories of positive/other and feminine/other.

Table 13.--Distribution of Responses by Evaluative Tone and Sex Stereotype on the "Who Am I?" Measures of the Self-Concept

	Percentage of Responses		
	Current Self (n = 1,190)	Future Self (n = 1,010)	Ideal Self (n = 1,105)
Evaluative tone			
Positive	49.0	61.2	80.6
Neutral	26.0	30.7	18.6
Negative	25.0	8.1	.8
Sex stereotype			
Feminine	40.2	40.1	37.3
Neutral sex	45.5	41.8	36.1
Masculine	14.3	18.1	26.6

NOTE: Percentages refer to the proportion of all responses that fell into each category, not to the number of subjects who used a category.

Bills et al. (1951) have noted, ideals tend to be stereotypic, descriptive of what a woman sees as socially desirable. However, I do feel the discrepancy measures can represent a person's degree of satisfaction with her current self as compared to her own conception of which qualities are desirable.

Table 14 summarizes the response distributions on the two coding dimensions, and the discrepancy measures, as mean scores; and reports the results of the tests for relationships with career salience. The typical woman in the sample describes her current self to an equal extent in positive and neutral/negative, feminine and neutral/masculine

Table 14.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for Selected Dimensions of the Self-Concept

	Response Distribution			Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	*r*	*p*
Evaluative tone					
Current self	246	1.511	.286	.0614	NS
Future-current selves discrepancy	218	.271	.251	-.0239	NS
Ideal-current selves discrepancy	228	.394	.264	.1345	<.021
Sex stereotype					
Current self	246	1.597	.227	.1216	<.028
Ideal self	231	1.627	.252	.1119	<.045
Future-current selves discrepancy	218	.205	.205	-.1102	NS
Ideal-current selves discrepancy	228	.238	.193	-.1063	NS

NOTE: Evaluative tone measures are coded 1 = positive and 2 = neutral/negative. Sex stereotype measures are coded 1 = feminine and 2 = neutral sex/masculine. Individual scores on these dimensions represent the mean score across all responses, with up to five responses coded per subject. Individual discrepancy scores represent the absolute difference between the two scores compared.

terms. Her ideal self is somewhat less feminine than is her current self-conception. There is more difference, particularly in evaluative tone, between her current and ideal selves than between her current and realistic future selves.

Concerning relationships with career salience, there is a significant tendency for strongly career-salient women to describe both their current and ideal selves as having more masculine or neutral sex attributes than is true for other women. There is no difference in the evaluative tone of the current self-descriptions related to career salience, but highly career-salient women have significantly higher discrepancy scores on this dimension than do other women. That is, their ideal selves tend to have significantly more positive qualities than do their current selves. However, the amount of the discrepancy between ideal and current selves on the sex stereotype dimension, and between current and realistic future selves on both dimensions, is not related to career salience. It is important to note that none of the significant correlations is very strong.

In order to be able to compare respondents on more specific dimensions of self-attitudes and their behavioral manifestations, and in order to insure that some negative self-evaluations might be elicited, the "Who Am I?" questions were supplemented with a personality inventory measure (item 74.).[39] The items chosen tap dimensions distinguished as corollaries of career salience in other studies, with an emphasis on personality characteristics that are stereotyped as masculine or feminine.[40] Although I attempted to develop some composite indexes based on these items, no index could meet all the reliability tests performed.[41]

Table 15 summarizes the response distributions and correlations with career salience for the personality inventory items.[42] At least three-quarters of the respondents view themselves as good at school work, ambitious, worried about their appearance, and as having many friends in college, while only about one-quarter see themselves as leaders. On a relevant item from the list of changes since entering college (item 83.), one-quarter of these women feel it is true that "I have become more interested in having a good time now and letting the future take care of itself." Responses to the remaining inventory items show no common patterns.

---

[39] Comparison of responses on the two types of items also provides a test of response consistency and of the reliability and validity of the coding scheme used for the "Who Am I?" measure. See Appendix 2 for a presentation of the relevant data.

[40] See Table 34 in Appendix 2 for a classification of these items by sex stereotype.

[41] See Appendix 3 for a description of the reliability tests used. With no direct test of the reliability of responses to individual items, the reported relationships with career salience are less meaningful or replicable than might be true if the item analysis had uncovered some broader underlying personality dimensions.

[42] Items l., p., and u., concerning specific behavior in relationships with male friends, are considered in the section on the influence of male peers in Chapter VI.

Table 15.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Personality Inventory Items

	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage True[a]	r	p
Am good at school work[b]	266	86.5	-.1152	<.030
Am a leader in most groups	268	26.5	-.1367	<.013
Lately, am often depressed	268	51.1	-.0418	NS
Don't speak up in class	268	59.0	.2191	<.001
Need people around	267	37.8	.1733	<.002
Am pretty	264	43.2	-.0463	NS
Want to get ahead in life[b]	268	84.3	.0993	NS
Can't control what happens	266	33.8	-.0101	NS
Am too emotional	267	62.9	.0721	NS
Like to compete	268	41.4	-.0495	NS
Worry about my appearance[b]	267	73.4	.1445	<.009
Am popular with boys	265	46.0	.0882	NS
Take things as they come	267	62.5	.0904	NS
Express my ideas strongly	267	62.2	-.2486	<.001
Worry about the future	268	61.6	.1147	<.030
Am afraid people won't like me	267	53.6	.1143	<.031
Don't say anything when insulted	266	41.7	.1030	<.047
Have many friends[b]	267	77.2	.0561	NS
Wished I were a boy	268	38.4	-.0392	NS
More concerned with good times now than with future[c]	263	25.9	.2460	<.001

Table 15.--Continued

[a] The percentage true represents the proportion of respondents who indicated that the characteristic is "very" or "somewhat" true of them. Responses are dichotomized for descriptive purposes only. In the correlational analyses, the five levels of response are retained for all items with relatively normal distributions, with codes ranging from 1 = very true to 5 = not at all true.

[b] Because of the strong degree of identification with these characteristics for the sample as a whole, responses were dichotomized into categories of 1 = very true and 2 = all other responses for the analyses of the relationships with career salience. The proportions of respondents answering "very true" on the four items are as follows: am good at school work, 33.5 percent; want to get ahead in life, 48.5 percent; worry about my appearance, 27.7 percent; and have many friends, 29.2 percent.

[c] Because of the skewed response distribution on this item, taken from the list of changes since entering college (item 83.), responses were dichotomized to compare those women who feel this is "very" or "somewhat" true of them or are uncertain how true it is (38.8 percent of the respondents) to those who say this is not true of them. Responses are coded so that a low value represents acceptance of this self-description.

Several of these personality dimensions differentiate among women with varying degrees of career salience. Common elements suggest that more highly career-salient women are more dominant and forceful in their relationships with others and less dependent on the approval of others than are less career-salient women. However, there is no evidence that these characteristics lead career-salient women to feel socially isolated. Also, the most career-salient women seem to worry less about a variety of types of problems than do other students. There are no significant differences in competitiveness, ambition, or emotional state related to career salience. Although only a minority of the entire sample admits to becoming more concerned with present pleasures than with the future since entering college, highly career-salient women reject this description significantly more often than do other women.

To return to the initial hypotheses, for this sample, there is no definitive relationship between the evaluative tone of the self-concept and career salience, although there is some indication that highly career-salient women would like to have more positive qualities than they do. There also is no definite trend of self-evaluation on the personality inventory items that is related to degree of career salience. There is some support for the second hypothesis in that the more highly career-salient women include more masculine and neutral sex qualities in their open-ended self-descriptions and rate themselves higher on masculine attributes in the personality inventory. However, there are few differences in self-concept on specific feminine personality strengths, suggesting that it would be more accurate to describe highly career-salient women as androgynous than as masculine.

Discussion of the Implications of the Findings

College Class

1. Career salience increases gradually over the four years of college, with the most significant increase in career interest occurring during the junior year. As predicted on the basis of the findings of the most recent, comparable studies, career salience increases progressively during the college years, though the interclass differences are not significant. The most significant increase in degree of interest in a career appears in the comparison of underclass and upperclass women.

These findings suggest several conclusions. First, the college years are not too late in an individual's development to affect attitudes towards career involvement. These women are still open to change, probably because they are adolescents, whose identities are not yet completely integrated, and because most of them have not made definite family and career role commitments.

Second, something happens during the college years to a significant number of these women that leads them to place more emphasis on a career as a source of life satisfaction. On the basis of the data presented so far, it is not possible to determine to what degree this increased career interest is a result of experiences in college, and to what extent it is an outgrowth of maturation, and, thus, might have occurred even if these women had not gone to college.[43] The question that asks these women directly how they have changed since entering college (item 83.), while giving some indication of the type of changes that occur, and of which they are aware, does not provide any definitive answer to this question. To briefly summarize, at least 60 percent of these women feel they have become more committed to a career or have begun to enjoy learning more since entering college. About one-half report that, during the college years, they decided to obtain further education, but the same proportion feel they have become more cynical about the value of an education. A minority, around one-quarter of these women, feel they have changed their career plans drastically, have become more interested in having a good time now rather than worrying about the future, or are more concerned now with marriage than with a career.[44] These self-reported changes corroborate the suggestions that changes in attitudes can occur in late adolescence - early adulthood and that the direction of change is towards heightened career and educational aspirations.

---

[43] Chapter VI considers the effects of one specific aspect of the college experience, the influence of teachers, on career salience.

In fact, a factor analysis of these items uncovers one consistent pattern of change, change in the nature of intellectual aspirations, defined by changes in interest in continuing one's education, career commitment, and enjoyment of learning for its own sake. Agreement that there has been a change in the nature of intellectual aspirations during college towards more concern with education and a career is strongly correlated with high career salience ($r = -.3890$, $p = < .001$). Since self-reported change in career commitment is included in the index, this corroborates the finding that career salience increases during college. Perhaps more importantly, this strong correlation suggests that one of the ways in which the college years heighten career salience is through developing positive attitudes towards the learning process and education. While one can still not say that such attitudes would not have developed without a college education, since these are some of the implicit goals of higher education, one might surmise that it is the college experience itself that has led to these changes that are important correlates of career salience.

---

[44] Specific response distributions and relationships with career salience for each of these types of changes are presented in the relevant content areas in the preceding sections of this chapter. The items concerning changes in relationships with parents (items e. and h.) are considered in Chapter VI.

[45] See Tables 54-56in Appendix 3. While the factor structure is not definitive, with some items loading equally on two factors, the final factors are basically uncorrelated. Only the intellectual aspirations dimension seemed definitive enough to consider that the component items might measure a unitary construct. With the weakest item, increasing concern with marriage rather than a career, deleted, the three remaining items do form a reliable index ($KR_{20} = .7626$), with a mean score of 2.404 (equivalent to a response of "somewhat true"), and a standard deviation of 1.006, for the 263 women for whom an index score could be computed.

Whatever the nature of the effects of the college years, the impact of these effects is most apparent in the significant increase in degree of career salience sometime during the junior year. It appears that those women who are closest to having to make decisions about marriage and career commitments are more open to change and influence and are more realistic about the satisfactions they may expect to obtain from noncareer options than are their younger sisters. In fact, upperclass women are significantly more likely than underclass women to agree that there has been a change in the nature of their intellectual aspirations, in the direction of more interest in education and a career, since entering college ($\underline{F}$ (1, 261) = 11.322, $\underline{p} < .01$). If one wants to encourage women's interest in a career, or help women to sort out their options and make realistic future plans, the junior year appears to be the best point for intervention.[46]

The evidence on the effects of year in school lends support to the enrichment explanation of the sources of career salience. Older, hopefully more mature, women, who have had more exposure to the broadening effects of a college education, are more interested in planning their future lives around a career.

---

[46] Comparisons of the response patterns of upperclass and underclass women on those variables that are strongly related to career salience provides further information about the nature of the changes that occur during or after the junior year that accompany the significant increase in degree of interest in a career. Such comparisons will be noted in the following sections.

Academic Achievement and Intellectual Interests

2. Career salience is higher among women whose academic achievement and self-ratings of ability are high. For this sample, the original hypothesis of no relationship between career salience and measured achievement must be rejected, although the observed positive relationship is not a strong one. Differences in self-ratings of academic ability more definitely distinguish degrees of career salience.[47]

One possible explanation of this deviation from the expected pattern is that at State, a "frog pond" effect (J. Davis, 1966) is in operation. As described in Chapter III, State is not a highly selective college. In this relatively "small pond," the aspirations of women who perceive themselves to be more able than their peers may be heightened more than would be the case in a more academically competitive setting.

It is also possible that there is systematic unreliability related to career salience in the self-reported achievement data. As noted in Appendix 4, the sample as a whole reports past achievement higher than that of the population they represent. Since more highly career-salient women see themselves as more able than their peers, there is the possibility that they inflated their actual achievement reports to match these self-conceptions.

---

[47] It is interesting to note that, while there are no significant differences in actual academic achievement between upperclass and underclass women, upperclass women are more likely to rate themselves as above average in ability compared to their college peers (Chi-square (1) = 7.8586, $\underline{p}<.005$; $\text{tau}_b = -.1796$, $\underline{p}<.002$).

In any case, the relationships between achievement levels and career salience are not strong enough to suggest that a program geared to heightening career interests should be oriented towards only high-achieving women. Further research is needed to determine whether there is a "frog pond" effect operating in nonelite educational institutions that leads to the heightening of career interests among the most able women.

Whether the finding that the most able women also have strong career interests indicates that career-salient women are deviant or just different is a matter of interpretation. In our society, individual achievement is not stressed for women, though it is a central cultural value. While they may "deviate" from the traditional female role, the possibility that the most able women plan to use their abilities in a career has positive implications for a society that depends on the full development of individual talents.

3. Career salience is not consistently related to a need for achievement or intellectual interests. Attitudes towards achievement were not given enough attention in this study. This is an area where additional study is necessary and where a questionnaire is probably inadequate as the sole measurement device. As the open-ended responses to the Anne case situation indicate, there is a great deal of ambivalence among these women, and perhaps among all women, about superior achievement. Since a career is a major avenue for

expressing achievement needs in our society, one would expect stronger relationships between career salience and achievement need than found here. Psychological ambivalence, particularly about the social consequences of achievement, does not seem to stand in the way of the development of career interests, but it is not completely resolved during the college years.

Educational Aspirations

4. Career salience is higher among women with high educational aspirations and expectations. The data provide strong support for the original hypothesis, while suggesting that the most definitive difference is that strongly career-salient women are more likely than other women to actually expect to realize their high educational aspirations. Also, the sample as a whole has high aspirations. Apparently, these predominantly working-class women are not satisfied with just bettering their parents' educational attainment by one level, but hope to insure social mobility by obtaining graduate school training as well. Still, there are important gaps between aspirations and expectations, with 15 percent of these women desiring to continue their education past college, but expecting they will not be able to do so, while others scale down their aspirations from wishing to obtain graduate degrees to the expectation that they may be able to take some extra courses. Also, regardless of degree of career salience, these women's actual plans for graduate study are rather indefinite.

The strong relationships between educational aspirations and expectations and degree of career salience suggest that one way educators could encourage women to be interested in a career is to support and heighten their educational aspirations. In fact, the data that estimate the effects of the college experience suggest that heightened educational expectations are one of the products of the college years, and that educational expectations are most open to encouragement during the pivotal junior year.[48] A career education program introduced at the midpoint in the college years, and aimed at encouraging women to consider a career as a significant life option, might be wise to encourage exploration and definition of educational goals, along with explicit career goals.

The gap between the educational aspirations and expectations of these women is important in and of itself. The most logical explanation of this gap for a sample of working-class women, financial obstacles, does not seem to account for the difference, at least as measured by self-reported reasons for delaying graduate work. More adequate counseling about graduate school options and the encouragement of specific plans might reduce this gap and the potential talent loss it represents.

---

[48] Upperclass women are significantly more likely than younger women to report heightened interest in obtaining further education since entering college ($F\ (1,259) = 20.3632$, $p < .01$). The increase in educational expectations is further corroborated by comparing the stated expectations of these two groups of women. Whether educational expectations are treated as continuum ($F\ (1,265) = 23.1492$, $p < .01$), or those with any graduate school plans are compared to those who do not plan any graduate work (Chi-square $(1) = 31.2163$, $p < .00001$; $\tau_b = -.3496$, $p < .00001$), the most significant differences appear in the comparisons of under- and upperclass women. In fact, while the underclass women are evenly split on the question of whether they plan to go to graduate school, 77 percent of the upperclass women have such plans. One should note that particularly in a sample whose predominant occupational goal is teaching, this heightened interest in further education may represent more understanding of occupational demands among the upperclass women, rather than a personal commitment to the intrinsic value of education.

The strong relationships between educational aspirations and expectations and degree of career salience lend support to the enrichment hypothesis. Further education leads to differential socialization and provides access to a wider variety of role models.

Educational and Occupational Values

5. Career salience is higher in women who reject family role-related motives for attending college or choosing a job. Contrary to the working hypothesis, which itself was based on contradictory findings in the literature, for this sample, educational and occupational value-orientations do interact with degree of career salience. To summarize, highly career-salient women are more likely to reject extrinsic rewards as motivations for college attendance or choosing a job, and are less concerned with the working conditions afforded by their ideal job than are other women. On the other hand, the most career-salient place more importance on the opportunities a job provides for independent and creative work than do other women. The most significant differences appear in the highly career-salient women's lack of concern with family needs in making her educational and occupational choices, compared to the strong interest in these motives expressed by her less career-salient sisters.

The strong relationships between the family-orientation value complexes and career salience suggest that this overlooked area needs more attention by other researchers to determine if the patterns uncovered for this sample apply to other women, or to men, as well. The fact that family role-related values help to explain career salience more than do more commonly measured value dimensions corroborates my contention that family and career concerns are inextricably intertwined in the future plans of young women. Also, since the career salience index emphasizes ways in which the family might bend to meet career needs, rather than the ways in which career needs might adjust to family responsibilities emphasized in the value inventories, the negative relationship between degree of career salience and the family-orientation value complexes suggests that there is a great deal of consistency between general values and personal plans among these young women.

However, one should be bothered by the lack of attention among highly career-salient women to redefining the nature of work responsibilities, in concert with attempts to redefine the necessary components of family roles. In hindsight, the specific items used here to measure family-orientation values, particularly the item that assumes that women may need to leave work during the child-rearing years, probably do not adequately represent the kinds of work adjustments that are most necessary to allow women to easily combine family and career responsibilities. Still, on the open-ended question concerning plans for reducing home-work conflicts, few of these women mention redefining the nature of work demands as a solution that would allow them to maintain continuous, productive work involvement. It may be that it is easier for young women to envision changes in family roles, since they have experienced family life directly, while actual experience in their chosen career is necessary before they can articulate how they might redefine the nature of work and career so that they may maintain their career and family involvements simultaneously. I would suggest that a career education program for women could explore how the structure and demands of our economic institutions serve to block women's continuous participation in work, while consuming all of men's energies, and, thus, making the sharing of family roles more difficult. Highly career-salient women who desire to have families and careers could force us to reevaluate the amount of energy, time, and productivity we require an individual to expend to prove his/her career commitment.

The particular value-orientation patterns uncovered for the sample as a whole are somewhat surprising. The literature leads one to expect less emphasis on self-expression, because they are women, and most are from working-class backgrounds, and less emphasis on extrinsic-rewards, because of their sex.[49] On the other hand, the almost universal emphasis on people-oriented values in choosing the ideal job is typical for women, and for individuals who choose the helping professions, the predominant occupational choices of this sample (see, for example, Cross, 1968; J. Davis, 1965; M. Rosenberg, 1957). It may be that the students of the 1970's have significantly different motivations for college attendance and job choice. Or, we may need to develop new measures of value-orientations. Overall, the self-expression and people-orientation items in the occupational values inventory did not differentiate well among respondents. Although the questions are not directly comparable, the responses to the question concerning motivations for working at all show little emphasis on these two areas.[50] It may be that respondents are too familiar with the typical occupational values inventory, and tend to answer in a socially desirable way.[51] Likewise, the socially acceptable answer for a woman who is asked why she works at all is to indicate she does so out of financial necessity (see Steinem, 1979). Open-ended measures of characteristics desired in the ideal job and in-depth exploration of motivations for working at all may be necessary to uncover individual value-orientations.

---

[49] Within the sample, the value-orientation measures that are significantly related to family socioeconomic status include the importance placed on getting a good job as a reason for going to college, with women from lower status families less likely to say this factor was "very important" ($\underline{r} = .1033$, $\underline{p} < .045$); and the family orientation indexes, with women from lower status families more likely to stress family role-related motives for college attendance ($\underline{r} = -.1026$, $\underline{p} < .047$), and job choice ($\underline{r} = -.1529$, $\underline{p} < .006$).

Finally, the data on reasons for choosing this particular college underscore the "nonchoice" nature of this decision for many of these women that also was evident in the pilot study (Guttmacher, 1971). Although these women cite the quality of the school as an important reason for their choice, they are more likely to have based their decision on the low cost, and are almost as likely to have chosen it because it was located close to home and friends, with the last motivation being significantly less characteristic of strongly career-salient women. The reasoning of less career-salient women is best expressed by one of the women interviewed in the pilot study: "I didn't really decide to come here. It was just where all the kids from my school went. Everybody came here. It's right down the street; it wasn't far." Because the college does not attract the academic elite, and because it offers only certain programs, this nondecision affects the peer role models to which one is exposed and limits possible occupational choices. Because of the degree of emphasis on cost, I would submit that one of the ways that socioeconomic status affects the career possibilities of women from working-class backgrounds is by limiting the range of educational institutions that they attend, a contention that is supported by the nationwide data collected by the Carnegie Commission (Anderson et al., 1972). This is an area where high school guidance counselors have to intervene to encourage able women from working-class backgrounds to consider a wide variety of institutional options and to acquaint them with the financial aid resources available.

---

[50] With three responses coded per subject, 37.2 percent of the reasons for working indicate a concern for self-expression, while only 13.1 percent concern a desire to work with or help others.

[51] Comparing the response distributions on the items in the occupational values inventory, it is clear that the more "unusual" items (e.g., interest in a "clean" job, and the family-orientation items), and those concerning the importance of extrinsic rewards, where there may be less general agreement as to the socially acceptable valuation, best distinguish among respondents.

Overall, the findings concerning the relationships between career salience and educational and occupational values might be interpreted as evidence of deviance among highly career-salient women in that these women express more interest in some "masculine" concerns, such as independence and creativity in work, and less interest in the family-related motivations that are central to the female role. However, they are somewhat less interested in extrinsic rewards than are their less career-salient peers, a more typically "feminine" pattern. Regardless of degree of career salience, these women are concerned with the opportunities for self-development and self-expression afforded by education and work. It is only when one asks why they would choose to work that the stronger needs for self-actualization of highly career-salient women become apparent.

Career Choice and Work Experience

6. Career salience is higher among women who chose their current occupational goal during college. The original hypothesis suggesting that women who choose an occupation early in life and retain a commitment to this particular choice through the college years will be more career-salient must be rejected for this sample, with the alternative hypothesis stated above describing a significant, though not strong relationship among these women. This is an area that needs more research attention, although the finding does corroborate Richardson's (1972, 1974) contention that occupational planning and certainty of choice are not necessary correlates of career salience. In this respect, highly career-salient women exhibit a typically "feminine" pattern: revocation of choices and flexibility in planning. One also might interpret this finding as an indication of a general openness to change among strongly career-salient women.

7. Career salience is not related to the prestige level of the occupational goal. The data provide only indirect support for this hypothesis, based on the fact that there is a range in degree of career salience in a group of women who choose occupations of the same status. The emphasis on the lesser professions probably is due to the fact that occupations such as teaching and nursing represent significant upward mobility for women from working-class backgrounds (J. Davis, 1965; Empey, 1956; Pavalko, 1968; M. Rosenberg, 1957).

8. Career salience is higher in women who choose occupations atypical for their sex. Although few of these women choose decidedly male-dominated occupations, the hypothesis is supported in the cases of occupational aspirations and expectations, though the sex-typing of one's occupational choice does not account for a substantial amount of the difference in degree of career salience. The hypothesis is not supported in the cases of the sex-typing of fields of study, which are unrelated to degree of interest in a career. The relationship of career salience and typicality of occupational choice probably is reciprocal, with strong interest in a career leading one to be attracted to male-dominated occupations where high career salience is the rule, while a prior interest in less typically female occupations also may lead to increased career salience. A career education program that encourages women to consider a wider range of occupational possibilities might bear fruit in the form of heightened interest in a career, but encouraging educational and family role planning probably is more important. This finding provides further support for the enrichment explanation of career salience, to the extent that high career salience is related to an opening up of occupational options.

Career salience is lower among women who desire to be public school teachers. There is a significant, and relatively strong tendency for the teaching aspirants, over one-half of the sample, to be less career-salient than other women who make a variety of career choices. This finding is not surprising in light of the data reported above on the effects of the sex-typing of the occupational choice or in light of the literature. Teaching is the archetypal example of a female-dominated occupation that does not require extraordinary amounts of training, that is in keeping with the nurturant emphases in the female role, and that, at least until recently, is relatively easy to move in and out of in time with the rhythms of child rearing responsibilities and the relocations necessitated by a husband's job. Yet, it is interesting to note that those women in the sample who choose nursing, which shares many of these characteristics, show no common pattern of degree of career salience.

Perhaps the most important finding about career choice among these women is the lack of variety in their aspirations. At a time when teaching openings were few, with only reductions in sight, over half of these women wanted to be teachers. The college had begun to respond to these employment realities by restricting the number of students who could enter education programs and developing new major offerings. Even with these changes, more upperclass women want to be teachers than are in education programs, and the number of underclass women who want to enter education programs exceeds the number of proposed openings. Some teaching aspirants are aware of the employment problem, but their awareness is a bitter one, showing little knowledge of alternatives. When asked "what job do you expect you will _really be able to obtain_?, the responses of teaching aspirants include the following: "teacher's aide," "waitress," "factory work," "none," "no job," "very little," "a job having nothing to do with what I went to school for."[52]

Regardless of the effect on career salience, something must be done to encourage these women to broaden their occupational choices. Even those women who are not strongly career-salient expect to work at some time in their lives, but the fields they choose do not offer them much chance for employment. This is a general problem for women, as noted by Hedges (1970) in his forecast of "manpower" demands for the 1970's, in which he predicted that unless the career choice patterns of college women change, greater unemployment will be their lot.

The data collected here suggest if one wants to intervene to encourage women to enter new fields, the college years are too late. The predominance of female-dominated occupational choices, especially teaching, appears as early as self-reported aspirations in elementary school, when 83.3 percent of the 240 women responding indicate they fantasized involvement in a "feminine" occupation. The opening up of possibilities and the encouragement of fantasy exploration should be a crucial part of career education programs at all levels, but particularly in the elementary grades. Specific methods of accomplishing this might include providing children information about a wide variety of occupations and providing direct contact with practitioners in these fields, including men and women in careers atypical for their sex. Also, children must be encouraged to develop all their abilities, regardless of sex. For girls, this would involve conscious encouragement by educators of exploration of athletic, mechanical, and scientific areas. If we want to make current affirmative action programs encouraging women to enter male careers a possibility as well as a philosophical commitment, we must begin to attack traditional patterns of sex role socialization early in life.

---

[52] The emphasis on teaching aspirations in this sample probably would not appear to the same degree if a sample from the same population were studied today. At the time the data were collected in 1973, an awareness of the "teacher glut" was finally filtering down to potential teachers and affecting educational policy. Since 1973, the annual, nationwide production of new teachers has dropped an estimated 42 percent, with only 6.2 percent of the Class of 1982 expecting to make teaching career (Jacobson, 1979). Although statistics grouped by type of college are not available, I expect that a higher proportion of women attending state colleges still aspire to a teaching career, though not to the degree evidenced by this sample. Teaching still represents a route to social mobility for working-class women.

Still, the data indicate that some change and broadening of occupational choice is possible later in women's development. Although "feminine" choices predominate at all choice periods surveyed, there is more variety in these women's current aspirations than in their fantasy and tentative aspirations. However, current aspirations are more varied than expectations, suggesting a retrenchment to female-dominated options that needs to be reversed. Although only 26 percent of the respondents feel that they have changed their career plans drastically since entering college and 58 percent report that they chose this college because it offered the program they had already chosen, the size of the group that is open to change is still significant enough to suggest that programs such as that outlined above should be continued at the high school and college level. Also, colleges such as the one studied could offer a wider range of major field choices. At State, only 14.3 percent of the majors offered are stereotyped as masculine. While these women underchoose even these meager offerings (only 10.7 percent of this sample choose the "masculine" areas), if a wider range of options were available and women were explicitly encouraged to enter nontraditional fields, these patterns might change.

The experience of the teaching profession suggests that knowledge of employment possibilities serves as an important impetus for change in aspirations. School personnel need to provide students with factual information about labor market realities and assessments of a student's chances for success in a career area systematically and early, before other options seem closed. Also, as I have suggested throughout this report, if we focus on increasing women's degree of interest in a career in concert with encouragement of nontraditional career choices, we may find that women's choices broaden as an outgrowth of increased career salience.

9. Career salience is not related to the amount, variety, or nature of previous work experience. Contrary to the original hypothesis, for this sample, no dimension of prior work experience helps to explain degree of career salience. It is possible that this lack of a relationship is due to the rather uninspiring nature of the jobs these predominantly working-class women have held.[53] For less advantaged women, jobs held

---

[53] Comparing the jobs held by this sample to the examples of jobs held by Angrist and Almquist's (1975) predominantly upper-middle-class sample, one sees that the latter group generally had experience in higher status, and more apprenticeship-type jobs than do these state college women. Within this sample, women from relatively higher status families are more likely than less advantaged women to have had job experience related to their current occupational aspiration ($r = -.1085$, $p < .039$), to report that such an apprenticeship was their most interesting job ($r = -.1378$, $p < .020$), and to describe a relatively high status job as most interesting ($r = .1378$, $p < .020$), findings that corroborate those of the pilot study (Guttmacher, 1971).

during high school and college may be viewed as a financial necessity, a means to a better end, and a constant reminder of the world they are trying to escape, rather than as the opportunity to test out occupational interests described by Angrist and Almquist (1975). Even those women who have had job experience that is related to their occupational choice do not differ in degree of career salience from women who have not had such experience, suggesting again that occupational choice processes and degree of career salience are relatively separate aspects of career decision making for women. The effects of prior work experience need further study to determine whether the social class background and the nature of the work experience of different types of samples explain the differences in study findings.

Sex Role Attitudes

10. Career salience is higher in women with egalitarian sex role attitudes. This hypothesis receives strong support, with the sex role ideology measures, evaluation of the women's movement, and amount of exposure to the women's movement being among the strongest correlates of career salience for this sample. Since the career salience index is itself a measure of sex role conceptions, this finding primarily represents a great deal of consistency between these young women's ideological stances and personal plans. It also is important to note that, although the literature suggests that women from working-class backgrounds should be quite "traditional" in their sex role ideology, these women

exhibit a wide range of belief structures.[54] The effects of exposure to the women's movement are quite striking, given that very few of these women have been directly involved in the movement. Their "exposure" consists primarily of reading books and attending lectures, suggesting that considering women's issues in the college curriculum can be an important contribution to changes in sex role attitudes and can lead to heightened interest in a career.[55]

Still, the reactions to the hypothetical examples of sex role dilemmas indicate that implementing beliefs in real life situations is difficult for these women. This particularly is true when it comes to family roles, as represented by the proposed solutions to Al and Margo's conflict over who should do the dishes. One of the dimensions measured by the career salience index is the desired degree of segregation of marital responsibilities, including an item concerning washing the dishes. Career salience is strongly related to the marital role ideology index, which includes items concerning division of labor in the home. Still, in a real life situation, highly career-salient women are as likely to fall back into support for a traditional division of labor as other women, with the only difference being that they refuse to explain this posture as a result of a belief that women should do the housework. It may be that the situation was not stated clearly enough.[56] Although one might agree, as implied in some of these women's responses, that, in the big picture, dishes are unimportant, these young women have not yet had to face what many adults striving to attain egalitarian marital relationships have discovered, that the "trivial" issues can be major stumbling blocks symptomatic of the retention of traditional dominance patterns (see, for example, Mainardi, 1970), and that, unless such issues are resolved, women who have a career simply add to their responsibilities, rather than changing their roles (see Poloma and Garland, 1971).

---

[54] Within the sample, the only differences in sex role ideology that are related to family socioeconomic status are that women from lower status backgrounds are less likely than other women to agree strongly with the propositions that support equal marital rights ($\underline{r} = .1012$, $\underline{p} < .050$) and abortion as a personal decision ($\underline{r} = .1089$, $\underline{p} < .039$).

[55] I attribute exposure to the issues posed by the women's movement to course work because I know that little movement activity had occurred on campus or in the surrounding communities at the time the data was collected. In the spring of 1972, a small group of women students conducted a poll to ascertain the degree of interest in women's studies, and, on the basis of the interest expressed, faculty began to consider women's issues in more detail in their courses, including offerings about women's history and feminist novelists. It was not until the fall after this study was conducted that an active women's group was formed, which itself was initiated by women in a Sociology of Women and Sex Roles course.

Career education programs might help women to implement their ideological commitments by incorporating role-playing in simulated real life situations into their curricula and by exposing women to role models who are themselves actively involved in both marriage and a career, and, thus, who could point out areas of conflict and suggest potential solutions. The data suggest that educational programs can affect sex role attitudes and personal plans for a career-salient life style.[57]

---

[56] The character of the responses suggests that the sample as a whole had a hard time understanding or identifying with this case situation. Perhaps the description does not make Margo sound tired enough. A number of women simply ignored the fact that Al promised to do the dishes, seemingly unable to consider such a possibility.

The strong relationships between sex role ideology and career salience reiterate the point that women who value a career highly have different sex role conceptions than outlined in the description of the normative dimensions of male and female roles. In this respect, they are "deviant," but the fit between their beliefs and personal plans suggests that these women are not maladjusted. They have an ideological commitment to opening up the avenues for personal expression for all men and women, as well as plans for meeting their personal needs for accomplishment and intimacy.

Family Plans and Attitudes towards Family Roles

11. Career salience is higher in women who plan to delay marriage.

---

[57] Within the sample, there is some evidence of change in basic beliefs about sex roles during the college years, but the relationship between sex role ideology and college class is slightly curvilinear, with the freshmen, and, to a lesser extent, the sophomores, showing the most traditional attitudes; the juniors expressing the most egalitarian beliefs; and the seniors moving back slightly towards the traditional pole. The only significant differences appear when the traditional, segregated marital role ideology scores of the freshmen are compared to the views of all other women (F (1, 161) = 4.9037, $p < .05$) and when the feminist attitudes of the juniors are compared to the index scores of the other students (F (1, 263) = 5.3635, $p < .025$). Since this is not a longitudinal study, one can not determine if the senior "reversal" is due to a reevaluation of earlier egalitarian beliefs under the pressures of more imminent marital decisions, or if these particular seniors were less influenced during the crucial junior year by the issues posed by the women's movement. Although there is a tendency for upperclass women to report more positive evaluations of and more exposure to the women's movement than do younger women, the differences are not significant.

12. Career salience is higher in women who plan to delay childbearing.

13. Career salience is higher in women who plan to have small families.

14. Career salience is higher in women who prefer an egalitarian division of roles in their own marriage. All of these hypotheses, based on studies of the typical pattern of family role enactment among adult women who do and do not work, receive strong support in this study of the family plans of college age women, with the marital role allocation dimension identified as a component, rather than just a correlate, of career salience. These findings indicate that young women plan their family commitments in the same way they engage in planning for careers, and that the family plans they make are realistic, and supportive of future career needs. Researchers need to pay much more attention to this area and educators might be wise to help women assess the realism of their family desires, given their career desires, and vice versa. It appears that young women do plan a life style, not just a career, so career education for women can be most effective if it stresses life style planning. Also, these data suggest that, since delaying marriage and childbearing and having smaller families are becoming the rule in society at large (Glick, 1975), we might expect that career salience among women also will rise, which might help to explain the increasing work involvement of women today, and which suggests that this pattern will continue.

The data also suggest that some aspects of family plans change during the college years. Sometime during the junior year, at the same stage in these women's college careers that career salience increases most dramatically, child bearing plans and attitudes also change.[58] Educators could provide support for the reassessment of family and career goals that appears to occur at this point.

The data collected in this study also suggest that there are several other aspects of family and general life style plans that help to distinguish degree of career salience among women and that could be studied profitably by other researchers to determine to what degree the findings of this study are generalizable to other samples. The following new hypotheses receive strong support in this study:

Career salience is higher in women who place less importance on marriage.

Career salience is higher in women who would not be very disappointed if they could not have children. It is important to note that, regardless of degree of career salience, almost all of these women want to marry and have children. The difference appears in the amount of psychological investment women make in the wife and mother roles. The findings are logical as, by preparing for and valuing a multiplicity of roles, career-salient women protect themselves against the disappointments that may come if situational contingencies make it impossible for them to enact one or more of their desired roles. Also, strongly career-salient women may be able to make more rational decisions about whom they marry and whether they have children because they are not as dependent on their family roles for self-definition as are less career-oriented women.

---

[58] Upperclass women are more likely to plan to wait until after age 25 to have children than are younger women (Chi-square (1) = 5.7848, $p < .002$; $\tau_b = .1670$, $p < .006$). While underclass women tend to feel they would be "very" or "quite" disappointed if they could not have children, upper class women are as likely to be "not at all" disappointed as they are to indicate any other response (Chi-square (3) = 10.33, $p < .016$; $\tau_b = .1804$, $p < .0009$).

Career salience is higher in women who do not consider physical attractiveness, a dominating personality, or success as a financial provider as necessary characteristics of a husband. As noted previously, the sample as a whole showed a great deal of agreement on the relative importance of the alternative husband's qualities, so these findings are based on the most obvious attitudinal dichotomies. What strongly career-salient women do not look for is clearer than is what they think is important, though there also are significant, but not strong, relationships between high career salience and an emphasis on choosing a husband who is sensitive and college-educated. These views are supportive of the egalitarian marital role conceptions of strongly career-salient women. This is an area that needs more exploration by other researchers and where open-ended questions might more successfully differentiate the mate selection criteria used by women. The data, particularly the finding that the importance of a husband's support for his wife's career is a definitive component of career salience, do suggest that these women consciously search out future mates who share their sex role expectations.

Career salience is higher in women who cite personal needs as motivations that make working necessary. To some extent this finding simply corroborates the point that one of the dimensions of career salience is the degree to which women define work as an outlet for self-expression. However, the wording of the question directed these women's attention to extreme circumstances, a situation in which most of these women, and probably most women and men, conjure up visions of financial emergency. Even with this cue, a small, but strongly career-salient group of women respond that they have to work because of an individual psychological need.

It also is important to note that almost all of these women, regardless of their own personal desires for work involvement, could envision some situation that might force them to work, with the typical woman able to cite at least two situations that might arise. It would be interesting to know if a sample of more advantaged women would be as cognizant of the economic contingencies that influence one's ability to implement personal desires.[59]

The findings concerning the relationships between degree of career salience and family plans certainly paint a picture of career-salient women as different from other women. They do not see their mother and wife roles as crucial to their future happiness, they plan to delay or reduce their commitments in these areas in ways that are supportive of work involvement, and, in their mate selection criteria, they continue to exhibit their commitment to variant sex role conceptions. Yet, they want to marry and have children. They are not "denying their feminine core" or exhibiting fear of marriage or childbirth (Lidz, 1968).

---

[59] Within this sample, made up of women from backgrounds representative of the middle of the status hierarchy, there are no relationships between perceived necessity to work or the number of situations cited and family socioeconomic status.

Rather, they are adjusting the nature of these roles to make room for work, and reducing their dependency on two ascribed roles as the basis of their feelings of self-worth.

Self-Concept and Personality

The self-concepts of the sample as a whole contain few surprises. It is not unusual to discover a predominance of positive self-descriptions, as people tend to identify themselves in terms of favorable attributes and identities, with the comparatively rare negative descriptions indicative of social identities that are so important that they must be included (Wellman, 1969). Although no one else has categorized "Who Am I?" responses according to sex stereotype, the emphasis on feminine qualities also is not surprising in a sample of women,[60] and perhaps especially in a sample from working-class backgrounds, where traditional sex role attitudes are strong.[61] The relatively greater emphasis on masculine qualities in the ideal self also is predictable, as ideals tend to parallel what is socially desirable, and, in our society, higher valuation is placed on masculine qualities (Brown, 1958; Lynn, 1959; McKee and Sheriffs, 1957; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968).

---

[60] In fact, many measures of masculinity-femininity are defined as those qualities that differentiate between the self-descriptions of men and women. See Nichols (1962) for a critique of such measures.

[61] See the discussion of social class differences in sex role attitudes in Chapter II.

15. Career salience is not related consistently to self-evaluation. For this sample, there is no relationship between current self-evaluation and degree of career salience. However, strongly career-salient women differentiate more between their current and ideal selves than do other women. While this relationship is not a strong one, this finding suggests that highly career-salient women are less satisfied with their current self-evaluation than are other women.

Some theorists would interpret the larger discrepancy in self-evaluation among highly career-salient women as evidence of maladjustment or low self-esteem. But, since career-salient women are just as positive in their current self-evaluations as are other women, the discrepancy data, rather than suggesting that highly career-salient women dislike themselves, simply may indicate that they have the highest ideal standards.

16. Career salience is higher in women who describe themselves as androgynous. The sample as a whole stresses stereotypically feminine attributes in their self-descriptions, but more strongly career-salient women do include significantly more masculine and neutral sex attributes in their current and ideal selves. However, the personality inventory responses indicate that these emphases are not at the expense of "feminine" concerns with affiliative and emotional qualities. These responses indicate that the important difference in the nature of interpersonal relationships is that highly career-salient women are less dependent on, less worried about, what others think of them than

are other women. There is no evidence that strong interest in a career grows out of, or leads to, social isolation.

Overall, it is more accurate to describe highly career-salient women as androgynous, as possessing both "feminine" and "masculine" strengths and weaknesses, rather than to suggest that they are masculine. While androgynous individuals are still in the minority in our society, this pattern suggests a personality enrichment, the potential to call up a range of individual responses depending on their appropriateness to a particular situation, that should serve career-salient women well in fulfilling their multiple roles.

In summary, it is important to emphasize that, for this sample, there are few significant relationships between career salience and self-concept, and that most of the significant relationships are not very strong. This suggests that the emphasis in the literature on explaining career salience among women as an expression of personality differences is not warranted. The lack of strong relationships, coupled with the fact that there is no evidence of instability, frustration, or negation of "feminine" strengths among highly career-salient women, strike a blow to the arguments of those who define strong interest in a career among women as a symptom of personal maladjustment.

Conclusion

This chapter provides a detailed profile of one group of college women and indicates that they have aspirations, values, attitudes, and life style plans that are remarkably consistent with their degree of interest in a future career. The data suggest that career salience is most strongly related to educational expectations, sex-typing of the occupational choice, sex role ideology, and family plans. Basic belief systems such as values and self-concepts do not help to explain degree of career salience as much as do specific aspects of future plans.

From a policy standpoint, this is fortunate, as values and self-concepts seem to be more impervious to change at the college level than are personal plans. Based on the finding that career salience increases during the college years, with the greatest increase occurring in the junior year, I pointed throughout the discussion section of this chapter to other changes that seem to occur at this pivotal point that need to be supported if one wants to heighten women's interest in a career. To the extent that one can estimate individual change on the basis of cross-sectional data, it appears that educational expectations tend to rise and childbearing plans tend to recede in importance during the crucial junior year. Also, there is some evidence that one basic belief system, sex role ideology, is open to change at this life stage, and that juniors hold the most egalitarian attitudes. I believe that there is enough evidence to suggest that a career education program aimed at junior women that focuses on helping them to sort out their educational, family, and career plans, with emphases on seeking consistency among these goal areas, on setting relative priorities, and on sequencing potentially competing goals, would effectively support the life style planning of these women.

On the other hand, career choices and the tendency of these women to restrict their choices to the typically feminine lesser professions seem to be "set" long before college. Educators and parents must intervene at the elementary school level or before to effectively widen the occupational choice decision area, and, as a possible indirect result, to heighten degree of interest in a career.

While career salience does increase in this cross-section of women during the college years, college class is not one of the strongest correlates of degree of interest in a career. The lack of significant relationships between college class and other strong correlates of career salience also suggests that maturation, or differing amounts of exposure to the educational experience, while important, do not account completely for the complex of factors that affect and are affected by career salience.

The following chapter considers the potential sources of influence of significant others on career salience. While it focuses on the relationship of parental attributes and parents' attitudes towards their daughter on a woman's degree of interest in a career, it also gives brief consideration to the influence of two groups of significant other encountered in the college environment, teachers and male peers.

CHAPTER VI

THE INFLUENCE OF SIGNIFICANT OTHERS ON CAREER SALIENCE

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings concerning the degree and nature of the influence of significant others on career salience. The variables are presented in the order in which they were discussed in the literature review, with each section beginning with a restatement of the relevant hypotheses formed on the basis of that review. Operational definitions of variables are presented, followed by a presentation of the results, and finally a discussion of the implications of the findings.

Results

Closeness to Parents

1. Career salience is higher in women who are not close to their parents, especially their mothers. The questionnaire includes a number of items that measure different dimensions of closeness to, warmth of relationships with, and degree of identification with parents. Table 16 summarizes the response distributions on a series of items that form reliable composite indexes measuring an overall feeling of

Table 16.--Distribution of Responses on Items in the Closeness to Mother and Closeness to Father Indexes

	n	Percentage True
Mother		
Understands me	260	56.5
Disagrees with me	260	47.3
Is dissatisfied with me	259	25.1
Listens to me	261	77.8
Go to mother for advice	249	67.5
Want to be like mother	258	58.9
Father		
Understands me	238	45.8
Disagrees with me	237	47.7
Is dissatisfied with me	238	21.8
Listens to me	241	64.7
Go to father for advice	213	38.5
Want to be like father	258	45.3

NOTE: The items from the inventory of parental characteristics (item 67.) are dichotomized for descriptive purposes only. In the index, all original response categories are retained.

closeness to or distance from one's mother and one's father.[1] Scores on the closeness indexes represent the mean of the standardized, non-missing scores on the six items, with a low score signifying that one is close to one's mother or father. The closeness to mother index has a mean of .0089 and a standard deviation of .7043 for the 263 women who responded to at least three of the component items. The closeness to father index has a mean of .0050 and a standard deviation of .6775 for the 243 women who responded to at least three of the component items. Scores on the two indexes are strongly, positively correlated ($\underline{r} = .4542$, $\underline{p} < .001$), indicating a tendency for a woman to be equivalently close to, or distant from both parents. However, as Table 16 shows, these women generally are closer to their mothers than to their fathers.

---

[1] See Tables 66-69 in Appendix 3 for the corroborating reliability data. As these tables indicate, wanting to be like one's father is a weaker component of the closeness to father index than is the parallel identification measure in the closeness to mother index. This probably is because wishing to be like a parent involves sex identity issues as well as closeness issues.

Table 17 summarizes the response distributions and relationships with career salience for several additional items that concern closeness to or identification with one's parents.[2] The responses indicate that a significant number of these women, though not the majority, feel some psychological distance from their parents, particularly their fathers, a disassociation which the literature suggests may be related to the fact that most of these women are upwardly mobile. Within the sample, with backgrounds representing the middle of the status hierarchy, there are significant tendencies for the lower status, working-class women to be less close to their parents, particularly their fathers, than are the higher status, middle-class women.[3]

---

[2] The items concerning alienation from, and understanding of parents, and the evaluative tone of reflected self-appraisals from parents are not included in the closeness indexes because they do not measure attitudes towards mother and father separately. In response to the question concerning to whom in the family one is closest, only 19 women mention their father, too few to allow for comparisons of those who are close to one parent or the other. This also is true in the case of the question concerning one's most admired man and woman, where only 34 respondents mention their father and 27 choose their mother. The index reliability analyses indicate that these differences in wording and response distributions are important, as these items have lower item-to-item and item-to-scale correlations than the items included in the indexes. However, responses to these items are positively related to scores on the closeness indexes.

Correlations between the closeness to mother index and alienation from parents: $\underline{r} = -.5599$, $\underline{p} < .001$; understand parents better: $\underline{r} = .2639$, $\underline{p} < .001$; mother is closest family member: $\underline{F}$ (1, 243) = 52.0175, $\underline{p} < .01$; admire a parent: F (1, 231) = 15.6239, $\underline{p} < .01$; evaluative tone of parents think I am: $\underline{r} = .4029$, $\underline{p} < .001$.

Correlations between the closeness to father index and alienation from parents: $\underline{r} = -.3630$, $\underline{p} < .001$; understand parents better: $\underline{r} = .3495$, $\underline{p} < .001$; admire a parent: $\underline{F}$ (1, 213) = 20.3532, $\underline{p} < .01$; evaluative tone of parents think I am: $\underline{r} = .2964$, $\underline{p} < .001$.

On the closeness to mother index, highly career-salient women are significantly less close to their mothers than are other women ($\underline{r} = .1930$, $\underline{p} < .001$). However, there is no relationship between closeness to one's father and career salience ($\underline{r} = -.0143$, NS). As shown in Table 17, there is no relationship between career salience and recent alienation from parents. In fact, highly career-salient women are significantly more likely than other women to feel that they have begun to understand their parents better since entering college. Although the closeness index scores indicate that highly career-salient women feel somewhat distant from their mothers, they are no less likely than other

---

[3] There is no significant difference in closeness to mother related to socioeconomic status ($\underline{r} = .0887$, NS), but there is a strong tendency for women from higher status families to be closer to their fathers ($\underline{r} = .2415$, $\underline{p} < .001$). There is a significant, but not strong, tendency for women from lower status families to want to be like their mother, or neither parent; while women from higher status backgrounds want to be like their father, or both parents ($\underline{F}$ (3, 254) = 3.2599, $\underline{p} < .025$). Women from lower status families are more likely to feel alienated from their parents now than are other women ($\underline{r} = -.1229$, $\underline{p} < .023$). There also is a significant relationship between the evaluative tone of reflected self-appraisals from parents and socioeconomic status, with lower status women more likely to believe that their parents view them negatively ($\underline{r} = .1813$, $\underline{p} < .002$). Responses on the remaining measures of dimensions of closeness to parents are not related to socioeconomic status.

Table 17.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for Selected Measures of Closeness to Parents

	Response Distribution			Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage		r	p
More alienated from parents since entering college[a]	263	28.5		.0516	NS
Understand parents better since entering college[b]	263	63.9		-.1052	<.044
	n	Mean Career Salience Score	F	d.f.	p
Closest to					
Mother	97	-.0929			
Other family member	154	-.0015	1.1316	(1, 249)	NS
Parent wants to be like					
Mother	91	-.1689			
Both parents	61	-.1029			
Father	56	.1082			
Neither parent	50	.2311	5.1886	(3, 254)	<.01
Man and woman admired					
Parent	48	-.2425			
All others	192	.1196	11.9273	(1, 238)	<.01

---

[a] Because of the skewed response distribution, this item was dichotomized for correlational analysis into categories of 1 = very, somewhat, uncertain how true (37.6 percent), and 2 = not very, not at all true.

[b] This item is dichotomized for descriptive purposes only. In the correlational analyses, all categories are retained, with codes ranging from 1 = very true to 5 = not at all true.

women to say they are closer to their mother than to anyone else in their family. I considered the relationship of career salience to the measure of which parent these women wish to be like, even though this variable also is part of the closeness indexes, because this is the item in the questionnaire that best approximates a measure of identification. Women who identify with their fathers are more career-salient than women who identify with their mothers or with both parents, but the most striking difference is the high career salience scores among women who don't want to be like either of their parents.

The respondents also were asked how their parents would describe them (item 47.a.). The responses to the cue "My parents think I am . . ." measure reflected self-appraisals, and, as noted in the discussion of self-concept theory in Chapter II, the ways in which one is viewed and interacted with by significant others become important parts of one's self-concept. Also, these descriptions give us additional information about the positive or negative affect of these women's relationships with their parents. Finally, the respondents were asked why they wish to be like a particular parent. The reasons given indicate the bases for their identification with their parents, as well as providing further information about the kinds of qualities they admire.

Table 18 summarizes the sample's responses to these two questions, showing the distribution by evaluative tone and sex stereotype.[4] Comparing the distributions for the respondents' perceptions of how their parents see them to the distributions for the subjects' own current self-concepts,[5] one notes that the sex stereotype distributions are similar. Parents are viewed as being more evaluative than the subjects themselves are; that is, few of the reflected appraisals from parents are neutral in tone. There is a significant, positive correlation between perceptions of parents' views and the subject's current self-concept on the sex stereotype dimension ($r = .1167$, $p < .038$), indicating that reflected appraisals from parents have some effect on these women's self-concepts. However, the relationship between the evaluative tone scores, though positive, is insignificant ($r = .1069$), suggesting that parental views do not have a major effect on these women's basic self-esteem.[6]

---

[4] See Appendix 2 for the definitions of the categories used and estimates of coding reliability.

The characteristics described as reasons for wishing to be like a parent are very similar in evaluative tone and sex stereotype to the qualities emphasized in the ideal self-concepts of the sample as a whole.[7] In both cases, almost all the characteristics mentioned are highly desirable. For individual women, there is no relationship between their ideals and the description of the qualities they admire in their

---

[5] See Table 13 in Chapter V.

[6] On the evaluative tone and sex stereotype dimensions, responses are dichotomized into categories of 1 = positive, 2 = neutral/negative, and 1 = feminine, 2 = neutral sex/masculine, respectively. Individual scores on these two dimensions represent the mean score across all responses, with up to five responses coded per subject. For parental appraisals, the sample mean for evaluative tone is 1.411, with a standard deviation of .300. The sample mean for sex stereotype is 1.669, with a standard deviation of .217.

[7] See Table 13 in Chapter V.

Table 18.--Distribution of Responses on My Parents Think I Am and the Parent I Want to Be Like

	Percentage of Responses	
	Parents Think I Am (n = 1,153)	Parent I Want To Be Like (n = 253)
Evaluative tone		
Positive	59.3	88.5
Neutral	10.4	10.7
Negative	30.3	.8
Sex stereotype		
Feminine	33.5	33.6
Neutral sex	53.8	36.4
Masculine	12.7	30.0

NOTE: Percentages refer to the proportion of all responses that fell into each category, not to the number of subjects who used each category. For My Parents Think I Am, up to five responses were coded per subject. For Parent I Want to be Like, up to two responses were coded per subject.

parents on the sex stereotype dimension (r = .0731, NS).[8]

Of even greater interest to the central focus of this study, none of these dimensions of parental appraisal or bases of identification with parents differentiates among women who vary in degree of career salience. This is true whether parental appraisals are considered alone or are scored as the amount of the discrepancy between the subject's own self-concept and her parents' view of her, or between the subject's current or ideal self-concept and the qualities she admires in her parents. Of particular relevance to the issue of the effects of the warmth of one's relationship with one's parents is the finding that there is no relationship between the evaluative tone of parental appraisals and career salience ($\underline{r}$ = .0829, NS).

---

[8] On the sex stereotype dimension, responses are dichotomized into categories of 1 = feminine and 2 = neutral sex/masculine. Individual scores represent the mean score across all responses, with up to two responses coded per subject. For descriptions of the parent the subject wants to be like, the sample mean is 1.672, with a standard deviation of .374.

Overall, the data support the original hypothesis of a negative relationship between closeness to parents and degree of career salience, and indicate that closeness to one's mother is the most important differentiating factor. However, highly career-salient women are no more likely than other women to perceive their lack of closeness as alienation from parents, or to feel that their parents feel negatively about them as people.

Parents' Occupational Status and Educational Attainment

2. Career salience is not related to parental socioeconomic status. A review of the literature indicates that there is general agreement that occupation, education, and income are important determinants of social status.[9] Occupational status usually is viewed as the central element in the status ranking, because it serves as the crucial intervening link between education and income. As explained

---

[9] Community studies also consider such visible symbols of status as residence, housing quality, community participation, or religious affiliation, but the relative importance of such status criteria tends to be community-specific. Such criteria are less relevant to studies of samples that are not based in one community than are the more universal factors of occupation, education, and income.

in more detail in Appendix 2, I chose to use a socioeconomic measure of occupational status, which reflects the income derived from, and education necessary to obtain, an occupation. Even though education is reflected in such an occupational status measure, most researchers agree that a person's educational attainment provides additional status information and, thus, should be considered as a separate status dimension (for example, see Coleman, 1973; Hollingshead, 1965; Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958; Kahl and Davis, 1955). In the case of income, the majority of the studies reviewed indicate that reported income is poorly correlated with other measures of socioeconomic status. The amount of income is a particularly poor criterion to use to distinguish among the great "common man" group in the middle of the status hierarchy, where there is a great deal of income overlap and variability. Most researchers suggest that income should be used as an element in determining occupational status placements, but not as a separate dimension of social status (Coleman, 1973; Coleman and Neugarten, 1971; Duncan 1961a, Kahl and Davis, 1955).

An additional issue arises when one wants to assign a family, rather than an individual, a socioeconomic status ranking. In the past, researchers ignored the issue of the impact of a wife's occupation, education, and income on a family's status position, choosing to equate the family's status with that of the husband. Coleman (1973) suggests that wives can act as brakes or prods on the social mobility of families. A wife's education and social aspirations are crucial determinants of the family's status symbol acquisition. In fact, in their Kansas City study, Coleman and Neugarten (1971) found that the wife's education was somewhat more highly correlated with the social status placement of the family, and with family income, than was the husband's education. However, a wife's occupation usually is not as highly correlated with family socioeconomic status as is her husband's occupation (Coleman and Neugarten, 1971; Duncan, 1961b). Coleman and Neugarten (1971) found that if a wife's occupational status is higher than her husband's, she raises the family's social status by working, with her occupational status determining whether the family is a "core" or "marginal" member of a particular social class group. While Coleman (1973) does not feel that a wife's occupational status should be included as a dimension of a social status scale, Haug (1975) suggests that the wife's occupational status should be considered if her status is higher than that of her husband.

The basic problem in considering the occupational status of wives is that a large number are still housewives, a role that can not be judged adequately by socioeconomic criteria. While the role is not viewed as one that takes much skill or training, the fact that a wife can "afford" to stay home reflects a certain degree of economic well-being in the family. For wives, educational background is more variable and perhaps more reflective of the wife's potential socioeconomic status as an individual than occupation can be.

Finally, researchers do not agree on whether composite indexes of socioeconomic status accurately reflect the way in which social status effects are felt in our society. Duncan (1961a) argues that one should use a multivariate framework in which each status dimension is considered separately, because status disequilibrium is high in our society. This is especially true at the blue collar/while collar line in the middle of the status hierarchy where, for example, unionized manual workers may have high income without having attained a high educational level. Status disequilibrium also is characteristic of women, whose income and occupational status may not reflect their educational attainment. Also, different status attributes may have different effects. For example, Coleman (1973) and Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) feel that education may have more to do with tastes, values, and status longings, than do occupational status or the income derived from it. Coleman (1973) suggests that composite indexes can be useful in eludicating broad patterns of the effects of the overall social status configuration, while individual status dimensions may be considered as sources of differentiation among families whose index placement is similar.

For this study, the subjects were asked a number of questions concerning their parents' occupational and educational histories (Items 49., 50., 51., 53., 56., 61., and 63.). I did not request information about parental income, because I feel that a daughter's knowledge of her parents' income probably is limited and open to error. The Hollingshead Occupational Scale, used here to code occupational status, considers income in determining the status placement of occupational titles.[10]

---

[10] See Appendix 2 for a discussion of the procedures used in coding occupational status and estimates of coding reliability.

Table 19 summarizes the occupational status and educational attainment of these women's parents. The typical father is a skilled worker with a high school education. The typical mother also is a high school graduate. Close to 60 percent of the mothers are currently employed, typically in clerical or sales positions. Father's occupational status and education, and mother's education are strongly, positively correlated. Mother's occupational status, while strongly, positively related to mother's education, is not strongly related to paternal status characteristics.[11]

One-quarter of these women report that their father has been laid off at some time during their lives. In about one-quarter of these families, the mother "married down," that is, her husband's occupational status is lower than her father's, or she herself works in an occupation with higher status than that of her husband. There are no cases of downward mobility of fathers, based on comparisons of the subject's father's occupational status to that of his own father. In 25 percent of the families, the mother has more education than does the father. The majority of these women identify with the middle class, although parental status characteristics would place about

---

[11] Correlations between the various status measures are summarized below. All correlation coefficients are significant at the .001 level, unless otherwise noted.

Father's occupational status and father's education: $r = .6177$; mother's education: $r = .2494$; mother's current occupational status: $r = .0937$ NS. Father's education and mother's education: $r = .4408$; mother's current occupational status: $r = .1488$, $p < .05$. Mother's education and mother's current occupational status: $r = .3559$.

Table 19.--Distribution of Responses on the Parental Socioeconomic Status Measures

	Father		Mother		Higher Status[a]	
	n	Percentage	n	Percentage	n	Percentage
Parental occupation	249		159		265	
Executive, large business, major professional		5.6		.6		5.7
Manager, medium-sized business, lesser professional		12.4		7.5		15.1
Administrative, small business, minor professional		16.5		15.1		20.0
Clerical, sales, technician, little business		16.9		48.4		28.3
Skilled manual		34.1		4.4		21.5
Semi-skilled manual		9.6		18.9		7.5
Unskilled manual		4.8		5.0		1.9
Parental education	264		270		...	
Some graduate or professional school		4.2		.4		....
College graduate		6.8		2.6		....
Some college		20.5		8.5		....
Technical, nursing, or business school		10.2		20.0		....
High school graduate		33.0		48.9		....
Some high school		18.6		14.8		....
Elementary school graduate or less		6.8		4.8		....

Table 19.--Continued

	n	Percentage
Father has been laid off	256	
Yes		23.4
No		76.6
Maternal occupational status dominance	271	
Yes		27.7
No		72.3
Maternal educational status dominance		
Yes		25.0
No		75.0
Social class identification	264	
Upper-middle class		22.0
Middle class		56.8
Working or lower class		21.2

[a] Father's occupational status or status of mother's current job, whichever is higher.

52 percent of the sample in the working class; 38 percent of the sample in the middle class, many of these being lower-middle class; and only five percent in the upper-middle or lower classes.[12]

---

[12] These placements are based on descriptions of social class groups in the literature (see especially, Coleman and Neugarten, 1971; Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958). Executives and major professionals with at least a college education are considered to be upper-middle-class; managers, lesser professionals, and administrative personnel with some post-high school education are considered to be middle-class, with those in the clerical and sales category considered to be lower-middle-class; skilled and semi-skilled workers with some high school education are considered to be working-class; and unskilled workers with an elementary school education are considered to be lower-class.

Based on the considerations detailed above, I tested three socioeconomic status indexes: a father's status index, composed of the mean of the scores on father's education and occupational status; a family status index, composed of the mean of the scores on father's education, father's occupational status, and mother's education, weighted according to the factor score coefficients; and a second family status index, composed of the mean of the scores on father's education, mother's education, and parents' occupational status, defined as father's or mother's occupational status, whichever is higher, weighted according to the factor score coefficients. All the scales are reliable, but I feel that the second family status index, which considers the possibility that a wife's occupational status contributes to the family's social position, best summarizes family socioeconomic status.[13] This judgment is corroborated by the fact that, in general, the family status index that includes the higher parental occupational status correlates more strongly than do the other two indexes with attitudes, values, and other characteristics that the literature suggests tend to vary by social status.[14] It also is strongly related to the subject's own social class identification.[15]

---

[13] Scale reliability coefficients for the three indexes are as follows: Father's socioeconomic status index, .7876; family socioeconomic status index with father's occupational status, .7036; and family socioeconomic status index with higher occupational status, .7340. The corroborating reliability data for the latter family socioeconomic status index are summarized in Tables 57 & 58 in Appendix 3.

As Table 19 indicates, the result of considering the higher of the two occupational statuses is to raise the occupational status distribution somewhat, although the father's occupational status is still the major determinant of the occupational status code (correlation of father's and higher occupational status: r = .8156; correlation of mother's and higher occupational status: r = .4122). Scores on this family socioeconomic status index also are strongly correlated to scores on the other two indexes (correlation with father's status index: r = .8910; correlation with family status index including only father's occupational status: r = .9616).

Before weighting, the mean score on the family socioeconomic status index is 4.313, with a standard deviation of 1.082, representing an occupational status placement midway between the skilled manual and clerical-sales categories, and an educational status placement midway between the high school graduate and technical school categories. The final family socioeconomic status index used in analysis, with item components weighted according to the factor score coefficients, has a mean of 1.769, with a standard deviation of .455. Scores range from a high status of .535 to a low status of 2.875.

As predicted, none of the measures of mother's or father's education and occupational status, or the socioeconomic status indexes, help to explain degree of career salience.[16] I also tested whether the relationship between career salience and socioeconomic status might be curvilinear. With family socioeconomic status index scores split into three equal size groups, representing high, medium, and low status within the sample, there is a suggestion of higher career salience in the highest status group than in the other two groups, but the differences are not significant.[17]

---

[14] Relationships between other variables and family socioeconomic status cited throughout this report refer to the relationship with the family socioeconomic status index that includes father's education, mother's education, and the higher of the parents' occupational statuses, unless otherwise noted. In general, the relationships between other variables and the individual measures of status characteristics or the socioeconomic status indexes are very similar.

[15] Women who identify with the upper-middle class have a mean family status score of 1.4549; women who identify with the middle class have a mean family status acore of 1.7464; and women who identify with the working or lower classes have a mean family status score of 2.1086 (F (2, 261) = 37.9953, $p < .01$; eta^2 = .2255, r^2 = .2240).

[16] Correlations between career salience and father's occupational status: $r = -.0844$; father's education: $-.0039$; father's experience with layoffs: $r = .0213$; father's socioeconomic status index: $r = -.0376$; mother's current occupational status: $-.0501$; mother's education: $r = -.0423$; family socioeconomic status index with father's occupational status: $r = -.0408$; family socioeconomic status index with higher parents' occupational status: $-.0593$; social class identification: F (2, 261) = .4731. All of the correlations are insignificant.

However, there is a significant, though not strong, relationship between maternal occupational status dominance and career salience, with women whose mothers hold a job with higher status than their husband's, or whose mothers married down, tending to be more career-salient than other women ($r = .1343$, $p < .014$). The other measure of family status disequilibrium, a mother's having more education than her husband, does not differentiate degree of career salience ($r = -.0314$, NS).[18]

---

[17] The mean career salience score for the 90 women in the high status group (status index scores .535-1.589) is .1138; the mean career salience score for the 90 women in the middle status group (status index scores 1.590-2.049) is -.0788; and the mean career salience score for the 91 women in the low status group (status index scores 2.050-2.875) is -.0236 (F (2, 268) = 2.0093, NS; $\text{eta}^2 = .0148$, $r^2 = .0071$). It appears that had there been enough women from upper-middle-class families to consider them as a separate group, the difference in career salience between those women and all other women probably would be significant. There also is a suggestion of higher career salience in the lowest status group than in the middle status group, but the difference is very small.

I also tested for curvilinear relationships between career salience and the other two socioeconomic status indexes, and looked for patterns in scalogram analyses using all three socioeconomic status indexes, but no patterns are evident. Oneway analyses of variance with scores on the socioeconomic status indexes split at the median into high and low groups, and crosstabulations of career salience and socioeconomic status with index scores on each measure split into two or three groups, also show no significant differences and no pattern. It is quite clear that, in the middle ranges of the status continuum, socioeconomic status does not predict degree of career salience.

[18] As the literature suggests, mothers in lower status families are more likely than those in higher status families to have higher occupational status, than their husbands, or to have married down ($r = .2227$, $p < .001$), and to have more education than do their husbands ($r = .2347$, $p < .001$).

The data support the original hypothesis, that there is no relationship between career salience and parental socioeconomic status. There is some suggestion that maternal status dominance is a potential source of strong career interests in daughters.

Mother's Work Patterns

3. Career salience is higher in women whose mothers have been employed outside the home.

4. Career salience is higher in women whose mothers have been employed outside the home and who have enjoyed working. Questionnaire items 56. and 57. requested detailed information about mothers' work histories and attitudes towards working. Almost all of the subjects' mothers have worked at some time. Among the mothers of the 264 women responding, 91.7 percent worked before marriage; 58.9 percent worked when their daughter was in high school; 58.9 percent are working at the present time; 55 percent worked after marriage, before having children; 43.2 percent worked when their daughter was in elementary school; and only 25 percent worked before their daughter was in school. At each of these periods, slightly more mothers worked full time than worked part time, with the proportion working full time increasing progressively as their daughters grew older.

The literature does not paint a clear picture of exactly what aspects of a mother's employment experience are the important determinants of whether her daughter will follow her example. Different studies have found career salience to be positively correlated to a mother's having ever worked, the total number of years a mother has worked, a mother's working full time, and a mother's employment status at the time her daughter's attitudes towards a career are ascertained. I defined a series of variables representing various characteristics of mothers' employment histories in order to determine if the important issue is whether a mother has ever worked or how much she has worked. I focussed my attention on a mother's employment during her daughter's lifetime, because this would be the period when a mother's work status has a direct effect on the daughter's life, and when any direct modelling effect would occur. Also, mothers' work patterns before having children are not as highly correlated to later employment as working in the post-children periods are to each other. However, any work experience might affect the attitudes towards working that a mother passes on to her daughter in her role as a definer, so all responses were included in the measures of the attitudinal dimensions, even if a mother only worked before her daughter was born.

Table 20 summarizes the work experience of these women's mothers and analyzes the relationships of different aspects of a mother's work history to her daughter's degree of career salience. There are significant, positive correlations between career salience and a mother's having ever worked; the amount a mother worked during the subject's lifetime, as represented by the mother's work history index[19]; and a mother's current employment. However, none of these relationships is very strong, with current employment showing the strongest correlation with daughter's degree of interest in a career. It does not seem to matter whether a mother was employed full time or part time; working at all is the important issue.

---

[19] See Table 59 in Appendix 3 for the correlations among the mother's employment variables included in the mother's work history index.

I also attempted to determine whether the nature of the jobs a mother has held might affect her daughter's interest in work. As noted in the last section, the status of the mother's current job is unrelated to a daughter's degree of career salience. However, since many of these mothers stopped working when they had young children, and only recently re-entered the job market, their current job may not be the "best" job they have ever had. There is a definite, though insignificant, tendency for mothers whose jobs have been, on the average, higher in status to have more career-oriented daughters than those mothers who have held lower status jobs. The relationship between the occupational status of the mother's jobs and career salience in the daughter reaches significance when one looks at the highest status job the mother has held.

I also attempted to determine if a mother's experience in a male-dominated field might lead to higher career salience in her daughter.[20] However, 70.1 percent of the mothers only have held jobs in female-dominated fields. Fifty-one mothers have held at least one job that is not dominated by one sex or the other, but most of these jobs are unspecified factory work, where they probably were doing "women's work." Only four mothers have held jobs in male-dominated fields.

---

[20] See Appendix 2 for a description of the methods used to determine the dominant sex in occupations.

Table 20.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Mother's Work Experience Measures

	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage	r	p
Mother has worked during daughter's lifetime	264		.1191	<.027
Yes		78.0		
No		22.0		
Mother has worked full time during daughter's lifetime	264		.0807	NS
Yes		47.0		
No		53.0		
Mother currently works	263		.1799	<.002
Yes		58.9		
No		41.1		
Highest status job mother has held[a]	254		-.1313	<.018
Executive, large business major professional		.4		
Manager, medium-sized business lesser professional		8.7		
Administrative, small business minor professional		16.9		
Clerical, sales, technician, little business		47.6		
Skilled manual		4.7		
Semi-skilled manual		21.3		
Unskilled manual		.4		

Table 20.--Continued

	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience		
	n	Mean Career Salience Score	F	d.f.	p
Reason mother works (worked)					
Nonfinancial	75	.2066			
Financial	160	-.0843	10.2248	(1, 233)	<.010
How mother feels (felt) about working					
Enjoys it	142	.0715			
Would prefer not to or hates it	104	-.1403	6.3878	(1, 244)	<.025
How father feels (felt) about his wife's working					
Glad	51	.2775			
Feels it's up to her	87	-.0971			
Would prefer she didn't or always complains	90	-.1034	6.7427[b]	(2, 225)	<.010
How subject feels (felt) about her mother working					
Glad	71	.3510			
Feels it's up to her	106	-.1306			
Would prefer, or wishes she didn't, work	53	-.1886	16.4114[c]	(2, 227)	<.010

Table 20.--Continued

	Response Distribution			Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	r	p
Mean status of mother's jobs[d]	254	4.449	1.348	-.1006	NS
Mother's work history index[e]	264	1.465	.345	.1324	$<.016$

[a] Because of the poor response distribution, the mother's highest status job was recoded into categories of 1 = high (executive, manager, administrative), 2 = medium (clerical), and 3 = low (skilled, unskilled, semi-skilled) for all correlational analyses.

[b] $\text{Eta}^2 = .0565$, $r^2 = .0388$

[c] $\text{Eta}^2 = .1263$, $r^2 = .1005$

[d] Mean status of all jobs mentioned, based on codes ranging from 1 = highest status level to 7 = lowest status level. The mean status for the sample falls midway between the clerical and skilled worker categories.

[e] The mother's work history index represents the mean amount a mother worked across four periods in the subject's lifetime: before the subject was in school, and while the subject was in elementary school, high school, and college. Possible scores range from 1 = never worked to 2 = always worked.

Although a mother's having held a relatively high status job does seem to have a positive effect on her daughter's degree of interest in a career, it is clear that the most important differentiating factors are the mother's, father's, and daughter's attitudes about the mother's employment. As predicted, if a daughter gets the message that her mother enjoys working, she herself is more likely to plan work as a significant part of her life.

The questionnaire also ascertained the daughter's perception of why her mother worked. Unlike the case of the subjects' own reasons for working[21], few of the respondents, only 29 women, believe that their mother worked because of the personal satisfaction she gained from doing her job, or because of a need for accomplishment or a need to use her special talents. Another 46 respondents feel that their mother worked because she needed a change or wanted to get out of the house. The majority of the respondents, 68.1 percent, believe their mothers worked for financial reasons, with one-third of these indicating that the mother's income was absolutely necessary for family support. Comparing those who view their mother as working for financial reasons to those who mention any nonfinancial reason, there is a strong relationship with the subject's degree of career salience, with those who believe their mother worked in order to meet some kind of individual need more likely to be career-salient.

There also are strong relationships between career salience and the father's and daughter's attitudes towards the mother's employment. Women who perceive their father as being supportive of his wife's employment are more career-salient than women who believe their father feels negatively about his wife's working, or than women whose father feels working is the mother's decision, regardless of his own preference.

---

[21] See Chapter IV for a discussion of the reasons the subjects would work outside the home. It is interesting to note that, although most of the respondents could think of several reasons they would work outside the home, the great majority only could cite one motivation for their mother's employment.

Likewise, those women who are glad their mother worked are more likely to have a strong interest in a career than those who feel negatively about their mother's employment, or than those who believe that their opinion about the mother's working doesn't matter.[22]

As expected, these attitudes are related to socioeconomic status, with mothers, fathers, and daughters in lower status families more likely to feel negatively about the mother's employment than those in higher status families. Lower status mothers also are more likely to tell their daughter they work for financial reasons than are higher status mothers. The mother's own attitudes show the strongest correlations with family socioeconomic status. Although, in this sample representing the middle ranges of the status hierarchy, one might expect the lower status mothers to be more likely to work, this does not seem to be the case. As one might expect, those middle-class mothers who have worked have held higher status jobs than have the working-class mothers.[23]

---

[22] The amount a mother worked during her daughter's lifetime, as summarized in the mother's work history index, is not significantly related to the mother's attitude towards (*F* (1, 237) = 2.855), or reasons for, (*F* (1, 228) = .5089) working; or to her daughter's attitude towards her working (*F* (2, 221) = 2.3707). There is a significant relationship between the father's attitude and the amount his wife worked, with fathers more likely to be supportive if their wife worked relatively often (*F* (2, 219) = 5.0582, $p < .01$).

The data support the original hypotheses, indicating that any mother's employment during the daughter's lifetime has a positive effect on a daughter's degree of interest in a career. The daughter's perception of how her mother and father feel about her mother's employment, and why her mother worked are even more crucial to determining whether she chooses to model herself after a working mother.

Dimensions of Differential Socialization

5. Career salience is higher in women whose parents share marital roles. I have suggested that it may be easier for women to foresee combining career and family involvement if their parents serve as nontraditional family role models. The dimensions of parents' marital role allocation of most interest are the degree to which the mother, as well as the father, has decision making authority; and the degree to which the father is involved in the traditionally female tasks of child rearing and housekeeping. Questions 67. and 68. include

---

[23] Relationships between the family socioeconomic status index and how the mother feels about working: $F\ (1, 244) = 7.5193$, $p < .01$; the mother's reason for working: $F\ (1, 233) = 15.1552$; $p < .01$; how the father feels about his wife's working: $F\ (2, 225) = 6.2022$, $p < .025$; how the subject feels about her mother's working: $F\ (2, 227) = 3.1771$, $p < .05$.

Correlations between family socioeconomic status and mother ever worked: $r = -.0001$; mother ever worked full time: $r = .0267$; mother currently working: $r = .0753$; mother's work history index: $r = .0081$. All of these correlations are insignificant.

Correlations between the family socioeconomic status index that includes only father's occupational status and the mean status of the mother's jobs: $r = .4891$, $p < .001$; the highest status job held by the mother: $r = .4198$, $p < .001$.

items that measure the subjects' perceptions of their parents' involvements in these areas.

Two items in question 67., the descriptions of who makes the major decisions in the family and who handles the money, form reliable indexes of maternal and paternal dominance, which load on unitary factors when analyzed with the other measures of parents' current behavior.[24] Scores on the two indexes are negatively correlated ($\underline{r} = -.3124$, $\underline{p} < .001$), indicating that, in general, decision making authority is not shared in these families.

The specific content of the measures of areas of child rearing involvement seems to be important, as the responses to these items do not indicate that there are consistent patterns of involvement or lack of involvement for either parent. Parents who helped their children with their school work also tend to have played with them, but taking on the role of disciplinarian is unrelated to these two areas of positive involvement.

In general, the fathers do not participate much in household tasks, except for doing home repairs, which 77.3 percent of the 247 women responding indicate is an activity their father engages in often. Taking out the garbage and shopping are acceptable to about one-half of these fathers, while less than 20 percent engage in the more decidedly female tasks of cooking, cleaning, and doing the dishes. An index of father's involvement in housekeeping was formed, although it has a relatively weak scale reliability coefficient.[25]

---

[24] See Tables 60-65 in Appendix 3 for the corroborating reliability data. The maternal dominance index is more reliable than is the parallel paternal index, primarily because, if mothers make the major decisions, they almost always also handle the money; while fathers may abrogate the latter responsibility without giving up their decision making authority. A third item, who gets the final say when there's a disagreement, might be expected to load with the other dominance measures. However, the response patterns indicate that the frame of reference for this item was too ambiguous. Some respondents seem to be referring to disagreements between their parents, while others interpreted this item as referring to disagreements between themselves and their parents. Because this item is ambiguous, it is not used in the analysis.

The distribution of the responses on these measures, and their relationships with career salience, are summarized in Table 21. For the sample as a whole, daughters are just as likely to view their mother as the dominant parent as to see their father as the parent in authority. While the mothers clearly were more active in child rearing, the majority of the sample also report that their fathers were involved.[26]

There is no relationship between career salience and maternal or paternal dominance, or paternal involvement in child rearing. There is a significant, though weak, tendency for strongly career-salient women to report that their fathers do more household chores than do the fathers of less career-salient women.

---

[25] See Table 72 in Appendix 3 for the scale reliability data. Although the home repairs item was basically unrelated to involvement in other household chores, and, thus, could be dropped from the index, the complex item-to-item correlations required that all the other items be included, even though some of the individual correlations are not very strong.

[26] Within the sample, lower status women are less likely than higher status women to view their father as the dominant parent ($r = .1373$, $p < .016$). Higher status fathers are more likely than other fathers to have helped their daughter with her school work ($r = .2026$, $p < .001$). The other measures of parents' marital roles do not show any significant relationship with family socioeconomic status.

Table 21.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Parents' Marital Roles Measures

	Mother				Father			
	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience		Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage True	r	p	n	Percentage True[a]	r	p
Helped me with my school work	267	65.2[a]	.2118	< .001	253	55.7	.0535	NS
Played with me	263	71.1[b]	.1439	< .010	246	66.7	.0377	NS
Punished me	260	78.8[b]	-.0568	NS	244	64.8	.1426	< .013

	Mother					Father				
	n	Mean Index Score	s	r	p	n	Mean Index Score	s	r	p
Dominance index[c]	263	2.093	1.117	.0137	NS	243	2.113	1.069	.0325	NS
Father's involvement in housekeeping[d]	...	.....	.....	.....	.....	247	1.699	.267	-.1182	< .032

Table 21.--Continued

[a] Responses are dichotomized for descriptive purposes only. In the correlational analyses, the original five levels of response (ranging from 1 = very true to 5 = not at all true) are retained for all variables with relatively normal distributions.

[b] Because of the overall high agreement with these items, responses were dichotomized into categories of 1 ="very important" and 2 = all other responses for analysis of the relationships with career salience. The percentages of "very true" responses are 44.5 percent for mother played with me and 43.1 percent for mother punished me.

[c] The sample means are equivalent to the "somewhat true" category, with possible scores ranging from 1 = very true to 5 = not at all true.

[d] The index score represents the mean of the nonmissing responses concerning father's involvement in five housekeeping activities, with individual item components coded 1 = quite often and 2 = rarely.

The major finding indicated by these data is that highly career-salient women are more likely than other women to report that their mother was not very involved with them when they were young. This finding may help to explain the relationship between career salience and current closeness to one's mother.[27] Highly career-salient women also are less likely than other women to view their father as the family disciplinarian.

---

[27] The suggestion that current feelings of closeness to, or distance from, the mother may be rooted in the mother's degree of involvement with her daughter in childhood is corroborated by the strong, positive correlations between the closeness to mother index and the subject's perception of whether her mother played with her ($r = .2900$, $p < .001$) or helped her with her school work ($r = .3095$, $p < .001$) as a child. There also is a weak, negative relationship between closeness and punishment by the mother ($r = -.1497$, $p < .008$).

6. Career salience is higher in women whose parents encourage their daughter to achieve and to be independent. The questionnaire includes two types of items relevant to testing this hypothesis. Respondents were asked to indicate to what degree their parents encouraged them to exhibit a series of behaviors as children (item 64.), and to describe the nature of their parents' current behavior and attitudes towards them (item 67.).

Looking first at the list of socialization emphases during childhood, almost all of these women report that their parents stressed doing well in school, while less than one-fifth feel that their parents were concerned with whether they did well in sports or were a leader. Slightly more than one-half of the parents encouraged their daughter to fight her own battles or to spend her free time near home. None of these socialization emphases are significantly related to degree of career salience.[28]

Table 22 summarizes the response distributions and relationships with career salience for the measures of parents' current emphasis on achievement and independence. Although the items concerning the degree to which each parent insists on high academic achievement differentiate well among the respondents, these emphases are not related to degree of career salience.

---

[28] See Table 26 in the section below on parents' sex role attitudes for a summary of the exact response distributions on these items. All the parents' socialization emphases items were dichotomized for analysis into categories of 1 = stressed and 2 = not stressed. The items on which there is little differentiation were dichotomized into categories of "stressed strongly" compared to all other responses for doing well in school, and any emphasis compared to "not stressed at all" for doing well in sports and being a leader. The correlations with career salience are as follows: doing well in school, $\underline{r} = -.0287$; doing well in sports, $\underline{r} = .0655$; being a leader, $\underline{r} = -.0319$; fighting your own battles, $\underline{r} = .0027$; and spending free time near home, $\underline{r} = .0125$.

The remaining items were included to determine if Kriger's (1972) findings that, among adults, homemakers report that their parents were overprotective or restrictive, while working women report that their parents were permissive, also might apply to young women who vary in degree of career salience. As Tables 61 and 64 in Appendix 3 indicate, the items concerning setting restrictions, worrying when the daughter is not home, and being protective load together on a general protectiveness factor. However, the scale reliability coefficients are low, so these items are considered separately in the analysis.[29]

The sample as a whole views their parents as very protective. In fact, the items concerning worrying when the daughter is late and being protective had to be dichotomized into categories of "very true" compared to all other responses in order to show any differentiation, because these descriptions are viewed as at least somewhat true of about 80 percent of the mothers and 75 percent of the fathers. Strongly career-salient women are less likely than other women to describe their

---

[29] I considered the fact that responses to the items concerning setting restrictions and worrying when the daughter is late may have different meanings for women who do and do not live with their parents. A number of women who do not live with their parents did not respond to the item concerning setting restrictions, which accounts for the lower response rate on this question. Even when the responses of women who do not live with their parents are excluded, the scale reliability coefficients do not improve. Allowing a daughter to live away from home may itself be an indication of parents' encouragement of their daughter's independence.

Table 22.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Measures of Parents' Current Emphasis on Achievement and Independence

	Mother				Father			
	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience		Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage	r	p	n	Percentage	r	p
Decides on restrictions for me -- true	246	43.5	.1689	<.004	229	37.6	.1600	<.008
Is lenient with me -- true	259	68.7	-.0415	NS	239	64.0	-.1120	<.042
Worries when I'm late -- very true	260	61.9	.1083	<.040	239	44.8	.0616	NS
Is protective towards me -- very true	257	42.8	.1332	<.016	239	39.7	.1150	<.038
Insists on high academic achievement -- true	260	58.8	.0492	NS	242	57.4	.0561	NS

NOTE: Responses are coded so that a low value represents agreement that the characteristic is true of this parent.

parents as very protective or restrictive. The majority of the respondents see both their parents as lenient, with strongly career-salient women more likely than other women to view their father as lenient.

7. Career salience is higher in women whose parents have high educational aspirations for their daughter. Table 23 reports the respondents' perceptions of their parents' educational aspirations for them. The typical parent would be satisfied if his/her daughter finishes college, while the majority of the daughters want to get some graduate education. Still, the daughter's aspiration, and, even more so, her educational expectation, are strongly correlated with her parents' desires.[30] The mother and the father tend to agree on how much education they would like their daughter to obtain (r = .7399). Within the sample, educational aspirations are related to family socioeconomic status for fathers, but not for mothers. Lower status fathers have lower aspirations for their daughters than do higher status fathers.[31] As expected, strongly career-salient women perceive their parents as having higher educational aspirations for them than do less

---

[30] See Table 8 in Chapter V for the data on the respondents' own educational aspirations and expectations. Only one mother and three fathers did not want their daughter to go to college. There are no cases of biparental nonsupport for college attendance.

Correlation between subject's aspiration and mother's aspiration: $r = .2859$; and father's aspiration: $r = .3459$. Correlation between subject's expectation and mother's aspiration: $r = .3690$; and father's aspiration: $r = .3965$.

[31] Correlation between family socioeconomic status and father's educational aspirations: $r = .1290$, $p < .025$; mother's educational aspirations: $r = .0372$, NS.

career-salient women (mother's aspiration: $\underline{r} = -.1648$, $\underline{p} < .004$; father's aspiration: $\underline{r} = -.1708$, $\underline{p} < .005$).

Table 23.--Distribution of Responses Concerning Parents' Educational Aspirations for Their Daughter

	Percentage	
	Mother (n = 252)	Father (n = 232)
Ph.D., LL.B., M.D.	11.1	12.9
M.A. or some graduate work	23.8	26.2
B.A.	60.7	58.2
Some or no college	4.4	2.6

8. Career salience is higher in women whose parents do not emphasize the enhancement of the performance of family roles as a reason for attending college. Parents' educational values were measured with the same series of items used to measure the respondents' own values (items 21. and 22.). These items were designed to tap three general value dimensions: self-development, extrinsic-rewards, and family-betterment orientations, with the item concerning learning a skill expected to be a link between the extrinsic-rewards and family orientations. The emphasis placed on going to college to please one's parents was envisioned as a separate issue.[32]

---

[32] See the discussion of the respondents' educational values in Chapter V for further specification of the expected content of these dimensions, and for a comparison with parents' values.

As could be expected, given the social class background of the sample, almost all of these parents, 95.8 percent of the mothers and 98.7 percent of the fathers, emphasize going to college to get a good job, with the great majority of these perceived as feeling this motivation is very important. The remaining items measure three value dimensions: self-development, family-betterment, and security orientations. This last orientation represents parental encouragement of college attendance to learn a skill, gain prestige, and please one's parents. The indexes formed to measure this dimension are not very reliable, and the individual items are not related to other variables in a consistent fashion, so this index is not used in analysis. The three dimensions are not independent, with relatively strong correlations among all factors.[33]

As the response distributions summarized in Table 24 indicate, this overlap in beliefs about the functions of a college education is due to the fact that parents are perceived by their daughters as endorsing all the cited reasons for college attendance, with the only significant differentiation occurring in the case of the family-betterment orientation. It appears that these parents see education as the answer to a number of needs. Within the sample, lower status parents are less likely than other parents to stress self-development as a motivation for attending college, while they are much more likely than other parents to advise their daughter to "get an education so you can have a better life than we had."[34] The other value measures show no significant relationship with socioeconomic status.

---

[33] See Tables 73-80 in Appendix 3 for the corroborating reliability data and the specification of the item components of each index.

Although the extent of value differentiation among these parents is limited, there are some significant relationships between parents' values and daughter's degree of career salience. Again we see the pattern of more significant, and stronger relationships between mother's views and daughter's career-orientation than for father's values. Strongly career-salient women are less likely than other women to report that their mother cautioned them to learn a skill just in case you have to work or stressed pleasing one's parents as sufficient motivation for college attendance. In the case of two measures of explicit parental advice that concern education (from item 69.), it is the fathers of strongly career-salient women who are less likely than other fathers to advise their daughter to get an education "just in case something happens." However, as hypothesized, the strongest relationships with career salience appear in the case of the family-betterment orientation. Strongly career-salient women are more likely than other women to feel that neither of their parents wanted them to go to college in order to be a better companion to their husband and a better mother to their children. For the sample as a whole, mothers are more likely than fathers to suggest these are good reasons to go

---

[34] Correlation between family socioeconomic status and mother's self-development orientation: $r = .1487$, $p < .008$; father's self-development orientation: $r = .1773$, $p < .003$; mother, get an education for a better life: $r = .1943$, $p < .001$; father, get an education for a better life: $r = .1946$, $p < .001$.

Table 24.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Parents' Educational Values Measures

	Mother				Father			
	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience		Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage Important	r	p	n	Percentage Important	r	p
Parents' advice								
Get an education so you can have a better life	271	56.8	.0111	NS	271	61.2	.0418	NS
Get an education just in case something happens	271	62.7	.0431	NS	271	55.0	.1306	< .016
Parents' educational values[a]								
Gain prestige	258	68.6	-.0067	NS	239	75.3	-.0470	NS
Learn a skill	259	76.8	.1406	< .012	239	80.8	.0607	NS
Please your parents	256	68.0	.1404	< .012	237	72.6	.0640	NS

Table 24.--Continued

	Mother					Father				
	Response Distribution			Correlation with Career Salience		Response Distribution			Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Mean Index Score	s	r	p	n	Mean Index Score	s	r	p
Self-development orientation	260	2.062	.755	.0705	NS	241	2.084	.820	.0104	NS
Family-betterment orientation	258	2.593	.907	.2238	$<.001$	237	2.808	.891	.1414	$<.015$

NOTE: Responses are coded so that a low value represents the opinion that a motivation is important.

[a] Responses are dichotomized for descriptive purposes only. In the correlational analyses, all codes are retained, ranging from 1 = very important to 4 = not at all important.

to college, but this is not true of the mothers of highly career-salient women.

In the summary of the discussion of the literature on the effects of parents on career salience, I suggested that, in a sample that includes a significant number of women from working-class backgrounds, one might expect to find that parents have less influence over their daughter's educational and career decisions than is the case for more advantaged women, because lower status parents are not positive models and can not provide relevant instrumental support. One study (Simpson and Simpson, 1961) suggests that career-salient women are less influenced by their parents than are other women.

The only direct measures of the respondents' perceptions of the degree of influence their parents have had on their decisions have to do with educational choices. Table 25 summarizes the response distributions and correlations with career salience for these measures (from items 19., 20., 25., and 32.). Regrettably, the questions concerning the relative influence of parents on the decision to go to college and on one's job choice were two of the questionnaire items where there was confusion about the directions, so that the responses of one-third of the sample had to be deleted.[35] Therefore, these data only are suggestive, though it is important to note that the relationships with career salience are consistent with the relationships for the two items from the value inventories that represent the views of all respondents.

---

[35] See Chapter III for a discussion of the nature of the problem.

Table 25.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Measures of the Degree of Influence of Parents on Their Daughter's Educational Decisions

	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage True	r	p
Went to college to please parents[a]	270	61.9	.2484	<.001
Chose this college because parents wanted[a]	267	48.3	.1113	<.035
Mother influenced decision to go to college	181	67.4	.2078	<.003
Father influenced decision to go to college	181	61.9	.1930	<.005
Mother influenced job choice	190	47.9	.3194	<.001
Father influenced job choice	190	34.8	.1725	<.009

NOTE: All items are coded so that a low score represents agreement.

[a] Responses are dichotomized for descriptive purposes only. In the correlational analyses, all levels of agreement are retained, with scores ranging from 1 = very important to 4 = not at all important.

The typical woman feels she has been slightly more influenced by her mother than by her father; and that her parents had more influence, or she was more responsive to her parents' desires, in the case of the decision to go to college than in the case of the more specific choices of which college to attend and what occupation to pursue. As expected, the lower status women are less likely than other women to report that either of their parents influenced their decision to attend college, and that their father influenced their job choice.[36]

On each of these measures, there is a significant relationship between amount of parental influence and career salience, with strongly career-salient women consistently reporting less parental influence or concern with parental wishes. The lack of influence of mothers is particularly evident.

9. Career salience is higher in women whose parents have egalitarian sex role attitudes. Parents' sex role attitudes were measured in several different ways. Respondents were asked to what degree their parents emphasized their own, their sisters', and their brothers' participation in a group of activities during childhood, with individual items chosen to represent areas where the literature suggests parents tend to differentiate on the basis of sex, and/or where socialization emphases differ by social class (item 64.). Respondents also indicated the degree to which their parents are concerned with their current involvement with men (items 67b. and m.), whether parents had given them explicit advice about female role expectations (item 69.), and to what degree their parents support women working outside the home and men helping around the house (item 67 c. and s.).

Table 26 summarizes the response distributions on the items concerning childhood activities parents emphasized as important for the respondent and for the brothers of the 203 women who have at least one brother. The subjects' perceptions of parents' emphases for their sisters are very similar to their reports of their own socialization, with some differences based on relative age.

---

[36] Correlation between family socioeconomic status and mother's influence on college decision: $r = .2644$, $p < .001$; father's influence on college decision: $r = .1832$, $p < .007$; father's influence on job choice: $r = .1874$, $p < .005$.

A number of these items show little differentiation, with almost all parents stressing housekeeping duties for their daughters, and doing well in school for both daughters and sons; while few parents were concerned with whether their daughters or sons were leaders, were popular with their peers, or acted out future family roles, or with whether their daughters did well in sports. Although the literature would suggest that parents, especially working-class parents, tend to differentiate the importance of these activities on the basis of sex, this clearly is not the case for these parents. On all of the items except for the male task of helping with the yard and the female task of helping with the dishes, the majority of the respondents report that their parents gave them and their brothers similar treatment. On most of the items, the average degree of differentiation is equivalent to stressing an activity strongly for one sex and somewhat for the other. For several of these activities, the amount of sex differentiation is related to family socioeconomic status, with lower status parents differentiating more between the treatment of daughters and sons in each case.[37]

---

[37] Lower status parents differentiate more on the basis of sex than do higher status parents in the amount of stress on helping with the housework ($\underline{r} = .1805$, $\underline{p} < .005$) and spending free time near home ($\underline{r} = .1441$, $\underline{p} < .020$), activities that are emphasized more for daughters; and on fighting one's own battles ($\underline{r} = .1352$, $\underline{p} < .028$), and doing well in school ($\underline{r} = .1287$, $\underline{p} < .034$), activities which are stressed more for sons. Concerning social class differences in activity emphasis for the subjects, lower status respondents perceive their parents as stressing helping with the housework more than do higher status women ($\underline{r} = -.1418$, $\underline{p} < .010$), while higher status women are more likely than other women to feel that their parents were concerned with whether they had a lot of girl friends ($\underline{r} = .1029$, $\underline{p} < .046$).

Table 26.--Distribution of Responses Concerning Differences in Parents' Socialization Emphases for Daughters and Sons

	Stressed for Daughter		Stressed for Son		Amount of Sex Differentiation		
	n	Percentage	n	Percentage	n	Mean Difference[a]	Percentage No Difference
Keeping own room clean	269	82.9	199	58.3	198	-.470	65.2
Helping with yard	268	31.0	200	67.0	199	.744	47.7
Having lots of girl friends	269	26.8	197	9.1	196	-.449	58.7
Showing control over emotions	267	45.3	198	41.9	198	-.081	79.8
Helping with dishes, ironing	271	75.3	201	14.4	201	-1.502	19.9
Playing house	268	11.6	197	.5	197	-.508	59.4
Fighting own battles	269	59.9	200	70.0	200	.265	76.5
Being a leader in activities	271	18.1	200	25.0	200	.045	88.0
Having lots of boy friends	270	10.0	194	22.7	194	.299	61.8
Taking care of younger children	261	48.3	197	24.9	194	-.613	51.5
Spending free time near home	271	50.9	202	47.5	202	-.119	81.7
Doing well in sports	269	16.7	201	40.8	201	.592	59.2
Doing well in school	269	91.1	201	90.0	201	-.050	89.6

Table 26.--Continued

[a] The difference scores are computed as the absolute difference between the degree of stress on an activity for sons and daughters. A negative score indicates an activity is stressed more for daughters, while a positive score represents more emphasis for sons. The possible difference scores range from -3 to +3.

Only two measures of parents' socialization emphases show a significant relationship with degree of career salience.[38] Strongly career-salient women are less likely than other women to report that their parents stressed their taking care of younger children (r = .1489, $p < .008$). This difference can be accounted for to some extent by the tendencies, documented in the next section, for career-salient women to come from smaller families, and for the few only children in the sample to be strongly career-salient. However, eldest children also tend to be more career-salient than later born women.

The second significant difference is that strongly career-salient women who have brothers are less likely than other women with male siblings to feel that their parents had sex-differential expectations concerning the degree to which children should help out with household chores (r = -.2681, $p < .001$). Since the "feminine" tasks of doing the dishes and ironing are the activities where respondents' parents tend to differentiate the most by sex, this difference is particularly significant.

---

[38] Because of the skewed response distributions on a number of the measures of parents' activity emphases for their daughter, these items were dichotomized for analysis to obtain the best approximation of a normal distribution. For those items where there was no particular pattern for the sample as a whole, items were dichotomized into categories of stressed/didn't stress. On items that were stressed to some extent by most parents, such as doing well in school, the responses were dichotomized into categories of stressed strongly/all lesser emphasis. On items that were not stressed much by most parents, such as playing house, responses were dichotomized into categories of any stress/not stressed at all.

Table 27 summarizes the available data concerning these women's perceptions of their parents' current sex role attitudes. The parental advice items were devised based on personal experience, and the comments of the pilot study sample. This novel approach to measuring parental attitudes was quite successful, as a number of the respondents identify these statements as familiar, which suggests that they tap important areas of parental concern, and most of the items differentiate well among the respondents. It is clear that, as a general rule, mothers are the primary advice givers; and that two advice areas, those concerning sexual and dating behavior, and definitions of the central dimensions of the female role, are primarily maternal concerns. An interesting exception to the latter pattern is that, although few women report that they have been told explicitly that "a woman's place is in the home," fathers are slightly more likely than mothers to emphasize this point.

As Table 70 in Appendix 3 documents, paternal advice can be reliably summarized in an unidimensional index that represents the degree to which a father emphasizes security, with a stress on planning for undesired contingencies, in his advice to his daughter. For mothers, female role and general security advice are related to each other in a very complex, and not always consistent fashion. Therefore, in the analysis of relationships with career salience, the individual items have been retained.

Table 27.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Parents' Sex Role Attitudes Measures

	Mother				Father			
	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience		Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage True	r	p	n	Percentage True	r	p
Parents' concern with daughter's hetero-sexual involvement[a]								
Wants me to be popular	260	42.7	.1029	<.049	240	29.6	.0538	NS
Is concerned about who I will marry	252	56.0	.1288	<.021	235	44.3	.0986	NS
Parents' sex role advice								
Put money away for a rainy day	271	66.4	.0389	NS	271	52.8	.0835	NS
A woman's place is in the home	271	18.1	......	....	271	21.4	......	....
No man will marry you if you're not a virgin	271	34.0	-.0578	NS	271	14.0	......	....
Be prepared to take care of yourself	271	63.4	-.0332	NS	271	55.3	-.0294	NS
Teaching is a good job for a woman	271	59.4	.1410	<.010	271	56.4	.1147	<.030

Table 27.--Continued

	Mother				Father			
	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience		Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage True	r	p	n	Percentage True	r	p
Pretend to be interested in what your date likes to do	271	19.2	......	.....	271	4.1	......	.....
A woman needs more than housework and a family to feel useful	271	25.8	-.1481	<.007	271	9.6	......	.....
Find a man who will provide for you	271	53.9	.1113	<.034	271	39.8	.1143	<.030
Having children is a woman's greatest fulfillment	271	38.8	.1510	<.006	271	9.2	......	.....
Parents' sex role ideology[a]								
Thinks men should help around the house	267	66.7	-.0653	NS	245	44.9	.0029	NS
Thinks more women should work outside the home	256	22.3	-.1928	<.001	235	16.2	-.2419	<.001

Table 27.--Continued

NOTE: All items are coded so that a low value represents the view that this is true.

[a] Responses are dichotomized for descriptive purposes only. In the correlational analyses, all levels of agreement are retained, with scores ranging from 1 = very true to 5 = not at all true.

On the other items included here from the inventory of parental characteristics (item 67.), mothers again are perceived as being more concerned than are fathers with these women's relationships with men. Mothers are more liberal than fathers on the two measures of beliefs about roles for men and women in general. However, very few of these women feel that either of their parents supports the idea of women working outside the home.

A number of these measures of parents' sex role attitudes are significantly related to degree of career salience among daughters, with mother's views again showing the most differentiation. Compared to other women, strongly career-salient women are less likely to feel that their mothers are concerned with whether they are popular or about whom they will marry, and are less likely to have been told by either parent that "teaching is a good job for a woman." Except for parents' advice that one should "find a man who will provide for you," which is more often reported by women who are not very career-oriented, emphasis on security-oriented advice is not significantly related to career salience. However, when the types of advice that fathers give most often are combined in the father's advice index, there is a significant, though weak, tendency for strongly career-salient women to report that their father gave them less "security" advice than do less career-salient women ($\underline{r} = .1212$, $\underline{p} < .023$).[39]

The reliability of the statistical tests is affected by the skewed distributions on the items that most directly measure positive parental support for female role conceptions that include a work component. However, I think it is important to note that there are definite tendencies for strongly career-salient women to report that their mother advised them that "a woman needs more than housework and a family to feel useful," and that both their parents support the idea that more women should work outside the home.[40]

To summarize, not all the individual measures of parents' socialization practices and sex role attitudes differentiate among women who vary in degree of career salience. These women's parents generally are quite conservative. However, there is enough evidence to suggest that the parents of strongly career-salient women relay somewhat less traditional, if not egalitarian, sex role messages to their daughters.

---

[39] The father's advice index score represents how many of the six component items are similar to advice a father has given his daughter. For the sample, the mean is 3.207, with a standard deviation of 1.862.

[40] Interestingly, although the literature suggests that middle-class and working-class parents should have different sex role attitudes, only one of these items, maternal advice that a woman needs more than a family to feel useful, is significantly correlated with socioeconomic status, with higher status mothers more likely than other mothers to give this advice ($\underline{r} = .1950$, $\underline{p} < .001$).

Other Aspects of Family Structure and Background

10. Career salience is higher in women who were brought up in small, rather than large, families.

11. Career salience is not related to differential socialization based on birth order or sex of siblings. As well as considering the effects of these specific aspects of family composition on the development of career salience in women, this section includes consideration of the effects of family members other than parents as potential role models and sources of advice. The literature suggests that career-salient women are influenced by more people in making their decisions than are noncareer-oriented women. Since one of the differentiating attributes of the career-salient women in this sample is their contention that their parents have not influenced their decisions, it is particularly important to determine if these women have other sources of support for their aspirations. Also, in a predominantly working-class sample, extended family ties can be expected to be strong, and other family members may serve important functions as significant others.

Eighty percent of the sample report that most of their relatives live in the same area of the state as their family, with half of these indicating that their relatives live in the same town. One-quarter of the sample report that someone else other than their parents and younger siblings lives in their home, but over half of these other family members are siblings over the age of 18 who still live with their parents. Fifteen women have grandparents living with them, while 16 women report that other extended family members or family friends live in their parents' home.

Although most of these women live in close proximity to other relatives, the majority still turn to nuclear family members for support. Only 11 percent of the sample mentions someone other than a parent or sibling as the family member to whom they are closest. Only 10 women indicate that they turn to an extended family member for advice about personal problems. As noted earlier in this chapter, these women most typically feel closest to their mothers and most often turn to their mothers for advice. However, siblings, especially sisters, also play important roles. More women report that they are closest to their sisters (27.2 percent) or their brothers (13.0 percent), than to their fathers. Among those who have sisters, 54.2 percent turn to their sisters for advice, while 23.2 percent of those who have brothers depend on their brothers for help with personal problems. Also, although relatively few of these women have college-educated parents, most have some other family members who are attending, or have attended, college, and who might serve as role models and sources of support for educational aspirations. However, only 17.7 percent of the respondents indicate that a relative other than a parent influenced their decision to attend college, and only 14.7 percent feel that another family member influenced their job choice.

The data relevant to measuring the effects of a woman's position in the family and the influence of other family members on career salience is summarized in Table 28. These women come from families of all sizes, with one-half having been brought up in families with four or more children, which are large families by today's standards. As predicted, there is a significant, though weak, tendency for strong career salience to be associated with smaller family size. Although eldest children score slightly higher on the career salience index, the difference between them and later born children is not significant. Only 16 women in the sample are only children. They do tend to score relatively high on the career salience index (mean score = .2086). Women who do not have brothers are significantly more career-salient than women who do have male siblings.

Since the number of women who cite specific family members as the person to whom they are closest, or the ones who have a college degree, are too few for statistical treatment, the responses were combined into broad categories for analysis. There is a significant, though weak, tendency for strongly career-salient women to feel closer to a male family member (e.g., father, brother, uncle), while less career-salient women more often feel close to a female. There is no relationship between the number of family members who have a college degree and career salience. However, there is a significant, but weak, relationship between strong career salience and being among the first generation in the family to go to college. As one might expect, lower status women are more likely to be among the first generation in their family to go to college (F (1, 217) = 4.6294, $p < .05$) and to report that no one in their family has gone to college (F (1, 266) = 12.9946, $p < .01$).

Finally, Table 28 reports the relationship between career salience and whether a woman lives with her parents, which perhaps is relevant to understanding the reported differences in degree of influence

Table 28.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Measures of Other Aspects of Family Structure

	Response Distribution			Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Percentage		r	p
Number of children in family	271			-.1019	<.047
One (only child)		5.9			
Two, three		45.8			
Four, five		30.6			
Six, seven		11.4			
Eight to thirteen		6.3			
Number of family members with a college degree	268			.0296	NS
None		18.3			
One, two		38.8			
Three, four		28.3			
Five or more		14.6			
	n	Mean Career Salience Score	F	d.f.	p
Is the eldest child					
Yes	116	.0641			
No	155	-.0415	1.6716	(1, 269)	NS
Has brothers					
Yes	203	-.0531			
No	68	.1733	5.9879	(1, 269)	<.025

Table 28.--Continued

	Response Distribution		Correlation with Career Salience		
	n	Mean Career Salience Score	F	d.f.	p
Generation of family member to whom subject is closest					
Own generation	116	-.0571			
Older generation	135	-.0194	.2093	(1, 249)	NS
Sex of family member to whom subject is closest					
Female	175	-.0945			
Male	76	.0960	4.6273	(1, 249)	<.050
Family members with a college degree					
None	49	-.0323			
Any	219	.0077	.1442	(1, 266)	NS
Generation of family members with a college degree					
Own generation only	154	.1563			
Older generation	65	-.0549	4.7797	(1, 217)	<.050
Where subject lives					
With parents	199	-.0896			
Other	72	.2617	15.4919	(1, 269)	<.010

and closeness to parents. The great majority of these women still live at home, with the remainder living in an apartment, rented room, or dormitory. There is a strong relationship between where the subject lives and career salience, with highly career-salient women more likely than other women to live away from their parents.

Table 29 summarizes some additional characteristics of these women's backgrounds. Most of these women come from intact families. The little experience of parental divorce is explainable by the fact that the great majority of these women are Catholic. The most typical woman is the granddaughter of Irish immigrants. There is no theoretical basis for hypothesizing that these characteristics are related to strength of career desires, and tests of the relationships with ethnicity, immigrant status, and religion, grouped into broad categories, show no career salience patterns.

What is evident to anyone who has had direct contact with the population this sample represents is the overall homogeneity of their social experience. The predominance of Catholics in the sample is true of the college population as a whole, and of the community, and even the state, in which the college is located. Although a number of ethnic groups are represented in the sample, the different groups tend to cluster in separate neighborhoods, and have separate churches and parochial schools. As far as socioeconomic background, it has already been noted that the sample is rather homogeneous. This is a reflection of the social class distribution in the communities served by the college. In an estimate of the social class distribution in 206 metropolitan

Table 29.--Additional Characteristics of the Respondents' Backgrounds

	Father		Mother	
	n	Percentage	n	Percentage
Family composition	271		271	
Lives with family		86.0		97.5
Is deceased		9.6		1.8
Is divorced and not living with family		4.4		.7
Ethnicity	269		267	
Irish		29.0		24.0
French/French-Canadian		16.3		16.5
English/Scotch/Welsh/ British-Canadian		14.9		18.7
Other Northern European		14.5		19.1
Southern European		11.5		9.7
Eastern European		11.5		9.7
Middle-Eastern		2.3		1.9
Native American		....		.4
Generation immigrated to the United States	211		214	
Subject		1.9		1.9
Parents		9.0		5.6
Grandparents		57.8		50.5
Great-grandparents		23.2		35.0
Earlier than great-grandparents		8.1		7.0

Table 29.--Continued

	n	Percentage
Religion	268	
Catholic		73.9
Protestant		13.4
Orthodox		5.2
Jewish		2.3
None		5.2

areas, Coleman (1973) places the two major cities served by State in the "lowest" groupings, estimating that only 36 to 38 percent of the population in these cities can be classified as lower-middle class or above. Finally, as the data concerning where their relatives live suggests, most of these women's families have experienced little geographic mobility.

For such a sample, the findings of other studies that indicate that career-salient women have access to a wider variety of role models suggest that any exposure to people who are different from themselves may be an important source of influence for women who, as a rule, have had little such experience. A handful of studies have considered the relationship of career salience to such factors as the size of one's hometown, urban versus rural residence, or the type of college attended, with equivocal results. Here, respondents were asked to indicate, to the best of their knowledge, whether the people with whom they went to elementary and high school, and the people in their neighborhood, were similar to, or different from, their family in religion, ethnicity, and income. They also were asked where they had lived during most of their life, and what types of schools they had attended.

As Tables 81-85 in Appendix 3 indicate, there is a definite tendency for women to report consistent patterns of homogeneity or heterogeneity in the backgrounds of the people with whom they interacted in their schools and neighborhood. Although religious, ethnic, and financial homogeneity tend to describe different dimensions of experience, these factors are all highly correlated, indicating a pattern of overall homogeneity or heterogeneity of experience.

Table 30 summarizes the relationships between diversity of experience and career salience. The sample is approximately evenly split on the issue of whether most of the people with whom they have had contact have been similar or different from themselves, with the most homogeneity occurring in the case of family income. Except for this factor, all of the indexes of homogeneity of experience are significantly correlated with career salience, with strongly career-salient women reporting more exposure to people different from themselves than do other women. The majority of the sample have spent their entire lives in the same neighborhood where their family lives now, and this factor shows no relationship with career salience. Although the majority of the sample attended public schools, a significant number have some parochial school experience. Although the relationships are not significant, there is a tendency for those who have attended public schools to be more career-salient than parochial school students, lending further corroboration to the suggestion that diversity of experience, which provides exposure to people with different values and

Table 30.--Distribution of Responses and Relationships with Career Salience for the Homogeneity of Past Experience Measures

	Response Distribution			Correlation with Career Salience	
	n	Mean Index Score[a]	Standard Deviation	r	p
Religious homogeneity index	269	1.421	.386	.1074	< .039
Ethnic homogeneity index	263	1.603	.414	.1136	< .033
Financial homogeneity index	268	1.364	.377	.0864	NS
Homogeneity of social experience index	268	1.463	.306	.1342	< .014
	n	Mean Career Salience Score	F	d.f.	p
Where subject lived during most of life					
Same neighborhood	173	-.0131			
All others	96	.0222	.1745	(1, 267)	NS
Type of elementary school attended					
Public	167	.0544			
Parochial	104	-.0776	2.5284	(1, 269)	NS
Type of high school attended					
Public	201	.0515			
Parochial	68	-.1168	3.2763	(1, 267)	NS

[a] The homogeneity index scores represent the mean of the responses concerning whether people in elementary school, high school, and the neighborhood were similar to or different from the respondent's family, with individual item components coded 1 = similar and 2 = different.

role conceptions, may lead to the development of career interests among women similar to this sample.

Teachers and Other Role Models

12. Career salience is higher in women who report that teachers and work role models have influenced their educational and career decisions. The direct measures of the respondents' perceptions of the degree of influence teachers have had on their decisions, items 19. and 32., are the items on which some women followed the directions, choosing only three "influentials," while others listed more than three. Looking at only those women who followed the directions, 59.7 percent of the 181 women responding indicate that a teacher or guidance counselor influenced their decision to attend college. In this decision area, school personnel tend to be listed as "somewhat" influential, while parents more often are listed as "quite" or "most" influential. In the case of the choice of a job, the degree of influence is reversed, with the 54.2 percent of the 190 respondents who cite a teacher as influential typically viewing a teacher as "most" influential, while parents are viewed as less influential in this decision area. Work role models are cited as sources of influence by 27.4 percent of these women. There is no particular pattern of degree of influence of work role models. Contrary to the hypothesis, at least for this subsample, degree of career salience is unrelated to the reported influence of teachers or work role models on educational and job choices.[41]

---

[41] Correlation between career salience and influence of teachers on decision to attend college: $r = .0354$; influence of teachers on job choice: $r = .0846$; influence of people who work at the job on job choice: $r = -.0463$.

Although these women do feel that their educational decisions have been influenced by teachers, other data indicate that they do not feel particularly close to their college teachers. Only 26 women feel that they would go to a teacher for advice about a serious problem (item 71.). Several women noted that it would depend on the nature of the problem, specifying academic problems as an area where a teacher's advice would be sought. Other women crossed out the "rarely" response choice and added "never" for teachers.

This feeling of distance from teachers also is evident in the responses to the item measuring reflected self-appraisals from teachers (item 47.b.). This question had one of the poorest response rates for any item in the questionnaire, although it is potentially applicable to all women. Of the 90 nonrespondents, three women noted that no teacher considers them a favorite, 22 women said they have no favorite teacher, and 10 women explained that no teacher knows them well enough to describe them. Of the 181 respondents, only 77.3 percent could think of five ways their favorite teacher would describe them, compared to an average of 85 percent for parents' or boy friend's appraisals. Six women could think of only one description, citing the most common response, "intelligent."

Table 31, which includes a summary of the nature of the subjects' perceptions of the appraisals of teachers, categorized by evaluative tone and sex stereotype, indicates that the content of the responses is much less varied than are the subjects' own self-descriptions or the reflected self-appraisals received from parents or boyfriends.[42] The great majority of the descriptions are positive, neutral sex attributes. Most of these appraisals have to do with competence, with an emphasis on descriptions such as "capable," "intelligent," "articulate," "conscientious," "a good worker." or "have potential."[43] Although the amount of differentiation in these descriptions is not great, highly career-salient women mention fewer feminine attributes in their perceptions of teacher appraisals than do other women ($\underline{r} = .1759$, $\underline{p} < .01$).

Overall, it appears that, for these women, teachers are role-specific significant others who do not have an important part in their total lives. Their interpretation seems to be that teachers are interested in them only in relation to their performance in the student role, and not as total human beings.

However, even viewed from afar, teachers do appear to be important role models for these women. Questions 72. and 73. asked women to name and describe one woman and one man they particularly admire. The specific people mentioned by the 221 women who responded

---

[42] See Appendix 2 for an explanation of the coding procedures. For comparison, see Table 13 in Chapter V for the data on the subjects' own self-descriptions and Table 18 in the first section of this chapter for the data on reflected self-appraisals from parents and the qualities admired in parents.

[43] With responses dichotomized into categories of 1 = positive and 2 = neutral or negative, the mean evaluative tone score for teachers' appraisals is 1.272, with a standard deviation of .253. With responses dichotomized into categories of 1 = feminine and 2 = neutral sex or masculine, the mean sex stereotype score for teachers' appraisals is 1.737, with a standard deviation of .207. Teachers' appraisals on the sex stereotype dimension are closer to the subject's own self-description than are the assessments of parents ($\underline{r} = .1877$, $\underline{p} < .007$).

Table 31.--Distribution of Responses on My Teacher Thinks I Am, My Boy Friend Thinks I Am, The Woman I Admire, and The Man I Admire

	Percentage of Responses			
	Teacher Thinks I Am (n = 807)	Boy Friend Thinks I Am (n = 874)	Woman I Admire (n = 396)	Man I Admire (n = 377)
Evaluative tone				
Positive	72.9	68.4	....	....
Neutral	15.5	7.6	....	....
Negative	11.6	24.0	....	....
Sex stereotype				
Feminine	26.4	49.5	34.6	28.1
Neutral sex	62.2	39.7	35.9	45.6
Masculine	11.4	10.8	29.5	26.3

NOTE: Percentages refer to the proportion of all responses that fell into each category, not to the number of subjects who used the category. For My Teacher and Boy Friend Think I Am, up to five responses were coded per subject. For The Woman and Man I Admire, up to two responses were coded per subject.

include political and religious figures, entertainers, writers, family members, friends, and teachers. Among women admired, the most common responses are aunt (10 percent), mother (12.2 percent), girl friend (15.4 percent), and teacher (25.8 percent). Among men admired, the most common categories are father (15.5 percent), teacher (22.7 percent), and boy friend (25.0 percent).

Strongly career-salient women are much more likely than other women to choose a teacher as a role model. Combining the responses of those who mention a teacher as either the man or the woman they most admire, the 88 women who name a teacher have a mean career salience score of .2957, while the 152 women who do not choose a teacher have a mean score of -.0967. This difference is significant, and is indicative of a strong correlation (F (1, 238) = 21.0771, $p < .01$).

Table 31 also summarizes the types of characteristics admired in men and women on the sex stereotype dimension. These women's descriptions of the qualities they admire are related to their own ideal self-concepts, which was not the case for their description of the parent they wish to be like.[44] It is clear that they admire men and women with a broad range of qualities, rather than admiring people who fit traditional feminine or masculine stereotypes. Although the sex-typing of the descriptions of admired men is not related to career salience (r = -.0024, NS), there is a strong tendency for highly career-salient women to cite more masculine or neutral sex attributes as the qualities they admire in women (r = .2001, $p < .002$).

For example, one highly career-salient woman admires a female teacher for her "intelligence, sense of humor; [she's] ambitious, hardworking, overcame many problems to get to the position she's in now. [She's] easy to talk to-- [you] don't feel any distance just because she has a doctorate." Another career-salient woman admires a male college professor for his "extreme sensitivity, and a gentle, peaceful way in his living manner. I've not seen this often in men."

---

[44] Correlations on the sex stereotype dimension between the ideal self-concept and the description of the woman admired: r = .1476, $p < .019$; and the description of the man admired: r = .1551, $p < .016$.

Although relatively few women describe those they admire in terms of their performance of family and occupational roles, there are several responses that specifically concern admiration for a person's ability to successfully combine family and career, most, but not all, of which are descriptions of women. For example, one woman admires an adult friend because "she is married with several young children and she is going to college and taking guitar lessons. She and her husband share _all_ household duties." Although this particular woman is strongly career-salient, the women who specifically mention the combination of family and work roles as a source of admiration show no common pattern of degree of career salience.

To summarize, for this sample, there is no relationship between self-reports of the influence of teachers or other adult models on educational and career decisions and degree of career salience. However, on an open-ended question, strongly career-salient women are more likely than other women to choose a teacher as the person they most admire.

Male Peers

13. Career salience is higher in women who date relatively infrequently. The data support this hypothesis. For the 168 women who report that they have a date at least one night a week, the mean career salience score is -.0969, while the mean score for the 78 women who report that they date no more than twice a month is .1410 ($\underline{F}$ (1, 244) = 6.7364, $\underline{p} < .01$). Sixteen women are already married, 42 women are engaged, and 142 women report that they have a steady boy friend. There is no relationship between having a steady boy friend ($\underline{r}$ = .0515, NS) or being engaged ($\underline{r}$ = .0454, NS) and degree of career salience.

Only 17 percent of these women admit to hiding their intelligence when on a date (item 74.p.). However, when those who ascribe any truth to this statement are compared to the 45.3 percent of the sample who say it is not at all true, there is a strong relationship with degree of career salience, with strongly career-salient women more likely than other women to say they never try to hide their intelligence ($\underline{r}$ = .2771, $\underline{p} < .001$). On the other hand, 37.1 percent of the 251 women responding feel it is true that they are often to blame when they break up with a guy. Such feelings of responsibility are unrelated to career salience ($\underline{r}$ = -.0336, NS), as are self-assessments of popularity with boys ($\underline{r}$ = .0882, NS).

One of the role dilemma cases poses a situation in which a woman has to choose between going on a date and keeping a prior commitment with a woman friend (item 77.) Wallace (1966) argues that dating and same-sex friendships are incompatible for women. The primacy of the desire to find a husband leads to social disintegration among college-age women. Somewhat surprisingly, in this sample, slightly more women, 47.3 percent of the 260 women responding, solve this problem by suggesting that Joyce should go out with her woman friend, while 41 percent would have her go with Pete. The most common solution mentioned by those who would go with Helen is that Joyce should explain the situation to Pete and set up a date for another night. Those who would go with Pete, most typically explain that if Helen is a friend, she should understand. The rest of the sample, 11.7 percent, suggest some compromise solution, such as making it a double date, or planning something that the three of them could do. It is clear that, whatever the solution, this is a real dilemma for these women. As explained by one respondent: "Because she had promised Joyce, she should go with her. She, however, won't. She'll go with Pete."

A random sample of the responses indicates that there is no relationship between career salience and the proposed solution to this dilemma. In fact, highly career-salient women are among those who show the least sensitivity to the woman friend's feelings. For example, one woman in this group suggests that Joyce should "go with Pete--it might lead to something much more rewarding than Helen could ever be." Another highly career-salient woman explains that "most girls would think you were a nut or wierd if you did not go out with Pete. A friend would expect you to go. If they belong to the lib, Pete would have to wait until Joyce is free." It is a woman who scores low on career salience who best states the primacy of friendships with other women:

> If Helen is such a good friend, Joyce should go to the movies with her, and try to make another date with Pete, because old friends are very important. Or else, maybe Pete and Joyce could arrange it so that Helen could double with them. Friendship means an unshakeable commitment.

To summarize, dating frequency is negatively related to degree of career salience, although strongly career-salient women are as likely as other women to have a steady relationship with one man, and do not seem to feel they are unpopular with men. The responses to the exemplary case indicate that career-salient women are at least as likely as other women to assign priority to relationships with men over relationships with women friends.

14. Career salience is not related to the reported degree of influence of male peers on women's educational and career decisions. Relatively few women report that male friends influenced either their decision to go to college (7.2 percent) or their job choice (18.4 percent). Female peers are viewed as somewhat more influential than men concerning the decision to attend college (23.2 percent), while they have less influence in the area of occupational choice (16.8 percent). In general, peers tend to be listed as only "somewhat" influential. Parents and teachers are not only more often cited as influential, but they also are rated higher in amount of influence than are peers.

Because so few women feel that male peers have influenced their decisions, the original hypothesis can't be tested with these measures. As an alternative, reports of any peer influence were combined for statistical analysis. Of the 181 women who followed the directions, and chose three people who influenced their decision to attend college, 28.4 percent mention a peer as influential. There is no relationship between peer influence and career salience ($r = -.1151$, NS). Of the 190 women who chose three people who influenced their job choice, 32.1 percent mention a peer. Again, whether one views peers as influential or not is unrelated to degree of career salience ($r = -.0406$, NS).

Even though few women feel that male peers have influenced their educational and career decisions, the majority of these women, 74.7 percent of the 221 women responding, turn to male friends when they need advice about a serious problem. Again, there is no relationship between seeking out male support and degree of career salience (r = .0312, NS). However, when the question is posed differently, and these women are asked whether they rely on male friends for advice (item 74.1.), fewer women, 45.7 percent of the 265 respondents, indicate that they depend on men, and strongly career-salient women are significantly less likely than other women to do so (r = .2203, $p < .001$).

As already noted above, a number of these women, 25 percent of the 220 women responding, choose their steady boy friend or fiance as the man they most admire. Although there is a tendency for the women who choose a boy friend to be less career-salient than those women who choose some other man as admirable, the difference is not significant (F (1, 218) = 2.2092, NS). Overall, these data tend to support the hypothesis that career salience is unrelated to respondents' perceptions of the degree of influence male peers have on them, with the exception that highly career-salient women react strongly against the implication that they need male help to make decisions.

15. Career salience is higher in women who believe that their special male friends approve of their having a career. A direct question asked these women whether it is true that "my boy friend(s) (or husband) expects his wife to stay at home and look after her family, rather than to lead an independent life outside the home" (item 79.o.). Other kinds

of support are measured by these women's perceptions of their boy friends' educational desires for them (item 28.) and their conceptions of how their boy friends would describe them (item 47.c.). On these items, only those women who have a relatively steady relationship with a man responded, which explains the relatively low response rates.

The item concerning a boy friend's expectations for his wife differentiates well among the respondents, with 46.5 percent of the 230 women responding agreeing that their boy friends want their wives to stay at home. Responses to this item are strongly related to degree of career salience, with highly career-salient women definitely tending to disagree (r = .4015, $p < .001$). The degree of difference in career salience is clear when those who agree and disagree are compared. The 107 women who believe that their boy friends want their wives to stay at home have a mean career salience score of -.2523, while the 123 women who disagree with this description have a mean score of .2247 (F (1, 228) = 33.2226, $p < .01$). A respondent's perception of her boy friend's attitude towards her having an independent life outside the home is one of the most important differentiating factors uncovered in this analysis of the effects of the attitudes of significant others on career salience.

On an ideological level, strongly career-salient women also are more likely than other women to disagree with the statement that "men don't like women who do things better than they do (item 79. m.), which 48.1 percent of the sample feels is true. However, this relationship is not very strong, perhaps indicating one reason for the ambivalence many of these women feel about female achievement ($r = .1343$, $p < .015$).

Of the 165 women who reported their boy friends' educational desires for them, 6.1 percent feel their boy friends want them to get a doctorate, 38.2 percent report they support their getting a masters degree or doing some graduate work, 51.5 percent feel their boy friends would be satisfied if they graduated from college, while only 4.2 percent believe that their boy friends don't want them to finish college. Boy friends' desires are strongly correlated to these women's own educational aspirations ($r = .5115$, $p < .001$) and expectations ($r = .5332$, $p < .001$). Boy friends' aspirations also are strongly correlated with these women's interest in a career, with strongly career-salient women who have a steady boy friend more likely than other women to report that their boy friends have high educational aspirations for them ($r = -.3343$, $p < .001$).

Most of the women who have a steady boy friend, 177 respondents, also ventured a response to the question of how their boy friends would describe them. As Table 31 on p. 354 indicates, the majority of the descriptions are positive, and few are decidedly masculine.[45] Reflected self-appraisals from boy friends are strongly related to this subsample's own self evaluations ($r = .1900$, $p < .006$) and the sex-typing of their self-descriptions (r = .2010, $p < .004$). Although there is no relationship between the evaluative tone of boy friends' appraisals and career salience (r = .0818, NS), highly career-salient women are less likely than other women to report that their boy friends would stress their stereotypically feminine qualities (r = .1402, $p < .029$). It does appear that, if a woman is involved in a steady relationship with one man, his attitudes are important predictors of her future plans.

---

[45] With responses dichotomized into categories of 1 = positive and 2 = neutral or negative, the mean evaluative tone score for boy friends' appraisals is 1.319, with a standard deviation of .289. With responses dichotomized into categories of 1 = feminine and 2 = neutral sex or masculine, the mean sex stereotype score for boy friends' appraisals is 1.494, with a standard deviation of .247.

Discussion of the Implications of the Findings

Closeness to Parents

1. Career salience is higher in women who are not close to their parents, especially their mothers. The relationships between career salience and the various measures of closeness to parents generally support the original hypothesis. The dimensions of closeness that were measured separately for mothers and fathers indicate that most of the difference is due to the fact that career-salient women feel more distant from their mothers than do other women.

Other data indicate that the psychological distance of career-salient women from their parents, and especially from their mothers, antedates their decision to choose a career-oriented life style. This suggests that high career salience is an outgrowth of this lack of closeness, rather than implying that a woman's decision to value a career highly is the cause of disagreements and distancing from parents. For example, highly career-salient women are more likely than other women to report that their mothers were not very involved with them as children. More career-salient women also feel that their parents, and especially their mothers, had little influence on their decision to attend college and on their occupational choice. Career-salient women are no more likely than other women to report that they have become alienated from their parents since entering college. This finding can be interpreted in two ways: either the apparent alienation of strongly career-salient women is long standing, or these women do not perceive themselves as estranged from their parents.

For these women, it does appear that more stressful family relationships do lead to the development of atypical, more career-salient life style plans. It may be that, as Rapoport and Rapoport (1971a) suggest, when a woman has experienced tension in family relationships, she has less reason to idealize family roles or to see them as sufficient to meet her personal needs or aspirations. Since, in general, these parents, and perhaps, as Bandura (1969) has suggested, most parents, are basically conservative about sex roles, a woman may need to feel some rejection in order to make atypical life style choices.

The career-salient women in this sample do seem to have received the "dose of maternal rejection" that Hoffman (1972) suggests is necessary for a woman to become independent and self-confident. It is important to note that this is a small dose; the differences are relative to the strong feelings of closeness that less career-salient women feel towards their mothers, and do not indicate a pattern of extreme rejection or conflict. Rather than interpreting conflict with parents as negative, one could view it as necessary in order to fulfill the adolescent task of forging a separate identity. I am bothered by the fact that some researchers interpret the results of a daughter's conflict with parents as negative, and assume that the career-orientation that seems to derive from this conflict is a sign of maladjustment, while applauding the achievement-orientation that men seem to derive from the same stressful family experiences. Independence and self-sufficiency should be encouraged for everyone.

In fact, there also is some evidence that the parents of career-salient women encourage them to be independent, and some cognitive distance from parents may be the result of this encouragement. Also, disassociation from parents is a logical consequence of the social mobility strivings that many of these parents have stimulated.

Finally, it is interesting to note that career-salient women are more likely than other women to feel that they are beginning to understand their parents better. This may indicate that once independence is established, these women may come to some resolution of their conflicts with their parents. In the meantime, there is a support vacuum for the career-salient women in this sample, while less career-salient women continue to be well-integrated with their families of origin.

Parents' Occupational Status and Educational Attainment

2. Career salience is not related to parental socioeconomic status. As predicted, there is no significant, direct relationship between career salience and parental socioeconomic status. The range of degree of career salience in the sample is greater than is the range of socioeconomic status, which provides further support for the

contention that family social status per se does not have an important effect on a woman's degree of interest in a career.

Because the degree of status differences is not great, with most of these women coming from families representing the middle ranges of the status hierarchy, parental socioeconomic status is not a consistently important predictor of other differences in parental behavior and attitudes that are related to career salience. However, there does seem to be a pattern in the socioeconomic status correlates that suggests there may be two different, class-related paths to high career salience among women. The lower status women in the sample are more likely to fit the deviance model's description of women who are not close to, or influenced by, their parents; while the higher status women best exemplify the enrichment model's emphasis on differential socialization in which parents encourage their daughter's independence and high educational aspirations. Researchers studying women from a broader range of family backgrounds, especially in cases where women from upper-middle-class and working-class families might be compared, would be in a better position to test the relevance of these suggestions of the existence of separate class-related paths to a strong career orientation.

Career salience is higher in women whose mothers hold higher status jobs than do their husbands or who married down. The one parental socioeconomic characteristic that does show a significant, though weak, relationship with career salience is maternal occupational status dominance, a form of familial status disequilibrium that is most characteristic of working-class families. Mothers who have had some cross-class exposure, either through their own jobs or through their father's job, seem to engender stronger career interests in their daughters, a finding that is consistent with other evidence that such mothers are an important source of social mobility strivings and high educational aspirations among less advantaged youth. This relationship also is consistent with the other data in this study that indicate that, for these women, their mothers' attitudes and behavior are more important determinants of whether they will turn towards or away from a career than are their fathers' attributes. The effects of status disequilibrium within the family may be a more productive area for further research than considering the effects of family socioeconomic status, which is determined more by paternal characteristics.

Mother's Work Patterns

3. Career salience is higher in women whose mothers have been employed outside the home.

4. Career salience is higher in women whose mothers have been employed outside the home and who have enjoyed working. Both of these hypotheses receive support, underlining the crucial role that female models play in determining whether a woman will plan a career as a part of her future desires. The findings suggest that it is easier for a woman to envision herself as a working wife and mother if her own mother has combined these roles. The modelling effect is stronger if the mother conveyed the impression that work is an enjoyable enterprise. In fact, if a daughter perceives her mother as disliking her work, which is most often true of working-class mothers, the positive effects of a

mother's role as a model of a working woman are cancelled out. Other measures of the impact of attitudes towards the mother's employment show the same patterns. The data also support the following hypotheses, which need further exploration by other researchers.

Career salience is higher in women whose mothers worked to fill some individual need. Those daughters' who feel that their mothers chose to work in order to meet their own needs for personal satisfaction, or in order to escape the boredom of household tasks, are more career-salient than women who feel their mothers worked out of financial necessity or a concern for family needs. The mothers in the first group convey two messages to their daughters. First, some of them share the definition of the value of work that seems to characterize career-salient women: that work can provide an important outlet for one's need for a sense of accomplishment. Second, they indicate to their daughters that family responsibilities alone are not enough to meet a woman's needs. The latter group conveys a different message: that a woman should only work if she has to, and that when she works she does so in order to fulfill the demands of her central family role. A number of the mothers who work in order to insure their family's security enjoy their work. For this sample, a daughter's perception of the reasons her mother works is more strongly related to career salience than is her view of whether her mother enjoys her work, which is the maternal attitude dimension that has received the most attention in other studies.

Career salience is higher in women who feel that their fathers support their mothers' employment. For this sample, career salience is as strongly related to a woman's perception of her father's attitude towards his wife's employment as to her perception of her mother's own attitude. Since almost all of these women want to marry, knowledge that a man can accept his wife's working, and not be threatened by it, may make it easier for a woman to consider combining a career and marriage. On the other hand, those women who have seen that their mothers' employment was a source of marital conflict may feel that the two goals are incompatible. The strength of the relationship between the father's attitude and his daughter's career desires also is consistent with other data that indicate that strong career salience needs male approval to thrive.

Career salience is higher in women who are glad that their mothers worked. The strongest relationship between career salience and the attitudes of family members towards the mother's employment appears in the case of the daughter's own report of how she feels about her mother's work involvement. As noted in Chapter II, Fogarty et al. (1971) suggest that such a finding simply measures an after-the-fact rationalization of a woman's own work choices, rather than indicating her true attitude towards her mother's employment. It is not possible to determine whether this is so, but it seems logical to suggest that this is a real difference, rather than an indirect measure of a woman's own desires. If a woman feels that her mother's work had a positive effect on her mother and had positive effects on her own life, she should be more likely to model herself after a working mother.

Overall, the data on the effects of a mother's work history on her daughter's degree of interest in a career provide support for the enrichment explanation of the sources of career salience, indicating that career salience is a result of exposure to a female model who has defined work as an acceptable part of the female role. Although a mother clearly has more potential impact because of her role as a primary socialization agent, exposure to other working women, particularly to women who have chosen to work and who enjoy their work, also might have a positive effect on women's attitudes towards careers.

Dimensions of Differential Socialization

Other than the definite effects of a mother's work involvement on her daughter's degree of interest in a career, the differential socialization model of the sources of career salience in women receives only limited, and not definitive support. The pattern of a lack of closeness to, and lack of influence of, parents is stronger, which, as I have suggested, may be due to the number of working-class women in the sample. Also, a number of the measures of parents' values and attitudes did not differentiate well among the respondents. To gain an accurate picture of parental socialization practices, a conversational interview may be a better data gathering device, or, one may need to obtain data directly from parents.

In almost all cases where parents' attitudes and behavior show significant relationships with career salience, the mother's attitudes are more often the differentiating factor, and, when both mother's and father's attitudes seem to have a significant effect, the mother's views show the strongest relationship. This suggests that measuring mother's and father's attitudes separately is an important mechanism for understanding parental effects on career salience. Because these women generally identify more with, and feel closer to, their mothers than to their fathers, their mothers have more influence on their future plans. Also, perhaps because it is the mothers of these women who have had more contact with the values of higher status groups, the mothers' attitudes are less class-based than are the fathers' views. Although strongly career-salient women report that they do not feel close to, and have not been influenced by, their mothers, it is more often from their mothers than from their fathers that they have received advice supportive of their future plans.

5. Career salience is not related to parents' division of marital roles. It does not appear that the strongly career-salient women in this sample have learned their egalitarian views about marital roles from their parents. In general, these parents have traditional marriages in which they do not share decision making authority and in which the husband does not help with household chores. What is somewhat surprising is that these women are no more likely to view their fathers as occupying the seat of family authority as to see their mothers as the dominant parent. As expected, fathers in lower status families seem to have the least authority. There is a significant tendency for more career-salient women to report that their father helps

around the house, but this is not a strong relationship, and the index used to measure father's housekeeping involvement is not very reliable. Still, this suggests one way in which parents may serve as models of the kinds of family roles that are most supportive of a woman's career involvement. The other important change in male family roles, the belief that men can and should be involved in child rearing, should receive support in at least one-half of these families. However, there is no relationship between the degree to which a father was involved with his daughter in childhood and her degree of career salience. Since these fathers generally have more conservative sex role attitudes than do their wives, active fathers may cancel out their effect as a model of shared child rearing through the messages they give to their daughter.

Career salience is higher in women who report that their mothers were not very involved with them when they were young. As already noted above, the most interesting finding concerning parental roles in child rearing is the relative lack of involvement of mothers of strongly career-salient women, which says more about the origins of the distance these women feel towards their mothers than about the effects of parents' division of marital roles.

6. Career salience is not related to the degree of parental emphasis on achievement. Almost all of these women report that their parents emphasized the importance of doing well in school when they were young, while very few encouraged their daughter to be a leader. Although there is more differentiation in the case of parents' current emphasis on academic achievement, degree of parental concern with a daughter's performance is not related to degree of career salience. However, I believe that the wording of the item designed to measure current achievement emphases affected the responses. Some women added comments that indicate that, while their parents want them to do well in college, they do not "insist" on such achievement. Since the parents of strongly career-salient women seem to be less directive than the parents of other women, the extremity of the verb used may have been particularly inapplicable to these parents. More attention to specific ways in which parents might encourage achievement may have uncovered differential patterns.

Career salience is higher in women whose parents are not very protective towards them. Although there do not seem to be any differences in the amount of emphasis on achievement related to degree of career salience, there is a definite pattern of more career-salient women viewing their parents as less protective and restrictive towards them than is the case for less career-salient women. This difference appears only in the case of current behavior, with no significant differences evident in the descriptions of independence training in childhood. For fathers, there is a suggestion of greater leniency throughout the lifetimes of career-salient women, who are significantly less likely than other women to report that their father punished them when they were young, and significantly more likely to view their father as lenient with them now. It is important to note that these are relative differences; most of these women feel their parents are somewhat protective. However, the data do suggest that the parents of career-salient women have given them more room in which to make their own decisions, and have encouraged them to some extent to distance themselves from family influence.

7. Career salience is higher in women whose parents have high educational aspirations for their daughter. This hypothesis receives strong support, though most of the effect of parents' educational aspirations on career salience is probably felt through the stronger direct effect that parents' educational desires have on a daughter's own educational aspirations, and especially her expectations. In general, these parents have lower aspirations than do their daughters, with most of them being satisfied if their daughter graduates from college, which will represent significant upward mobility compared to their own educational status.

8. Career salience is higher in women whose parents do not emphasize the enhancement of the performance of family roles as a reason for attending college. The original hypothesis receives strong support, with highly career-salient women particularly noting that their mothers do not tie the value of education to family roles. This is an important difference as it implies that the parents of highly

career-salient women have emphasized the value of education to a daughter's chances for individual achievement, not as an element in her other-directed family role. This is further corroborated by the fact that the parents of highly career-salient women are less likely than the parents of other women to see education as an insurance policy "just in case" it is needed. Rather than being a hedge against life's hazards, education is of value to a daughter's own individual mobility.

Although the literature review suggested that the enhancement of family role performance should be a middle-class rationalization for a daughter's college attendance, within this sample, there is no relationship between parental socioeconomic status and emphasis on this educational function. In fact, as noted in Chapter V, among the daughters, it is the lower status women who are most likely to hold this view, which implies some criticism of their own less-educated mother's performance of family roles.

The most interesting finding concerning parents' educational values is the degree to which many of these parents seem to view a college education as the key to meeting many disparate needs. These parents may view education as the main missing ingredient in their own lives and the main reason for their relative lack of success. By insuring that their children get a college education, they may feel they are bequeathing them instant success. As one would expect, it is the lower status parents who more often specifically mention education as the key to a better life. They are less concerned than are higher status parents with the opportunities for self-development that an education may offer their daughter. In fact, as Gans (1962) and S. M. Miller and Riesman (1961b) suggest, while working-class parents value the opportunities that education may offer, they may fear the content of education, the exposure to new ideas and values, which may estrange their children from them.

Career salience is higher in women who feel that their parents have not influenced their educational and career decisions. There are strong, negative relationships between career salience and respondents' perceptions of the amount of influence parents had on their decision to attend college and on their choice of what occupation to pursue. These differences in degree of parental influence are related to closeness to parents, indicating that the lack of influence of parents is part of the general pattern of career-salient women feeling more distant from their parents. However, the amount of parental influence also is related to parents' protectiveness towards their daughter, suggesting that the parents of career-salient women may have encouraged them to make their own decisions, rather than that career-salient women rejected the advice that their parents gave them. For example, women who report that their mothers did not influence their job choice also are likely to feel somewhat distant from their mothers ($r = .1459$, $p < .024$), but they are even more likely to feel that their mother is not very protective towards them ($r = .1901$, $p < .001$). Also, in the responses to the items in the parents' educational values inventory, strongly career-salient women are significantly less likely than other women to feel that their mothers see pleasing one's parents as a relevant consideration in deciding whether to go to college.

The pattern of parents having less influence on educational and career decisions is more characteristic of lower status families, corroborating the earlier suggestion that lower status women may not feel that their parents have the expertise to give them advice in these areas. This also suggests that these women in particular, as well as all career-salient women, need support and advice from other sources.

9. Career salience is higher in women whose parents, especially mothers, give them less traditional sex role advice. The data do indicate that the parents of more career-salient women are less traditional in their sex role attitudes than are other parents, though the differences are not great. Perhaps most significantly, although few of these parents express support for women working outside the home, career-salient women perceive their parents as more supportive of women's employment than do other women.

The data on childhood sex role socialization show few differences related to career salience. These items were not very successful in distinguishing among respondents. This is an area where short questionnaire items can't adequately tap the nature of past experience and where free flowing conversational interviews might be more successful. Still, the data do indicate a pattern in which the parents of career-salient women place less stress than the parents of other women on their daughter's learning the domestic chores associated with the female role, and are more likely to expect both sons and daughters to participate in household chores, which fits with their own role sharing in this area. The distinguishing element in sex role socialization patterns seems to be that the parents of career-salient women place less emphasis on learning the traditional female tasks than do other parents, not that they encourage their daughters to participate in masculine activities.

To summarize, there is evidence that career-salient women have been socialized differently than other women, which supports the enrichment explanation of the sources of career salience. However, in this sample, the pattern of less influence by, and less closeness to, parents is more predictive of strong career interests than is the differential socialization model.

Other Aspects of Family Structure and Background

10. Career salience is higher in women who were brought up in small, rather than large, families.

11. Career salience is higher in women who do not have brothers.

Family composition and a woman's position in the family do seem to be related to career salience, although these are not particularly important predictors. In the review of the literature, I suggested that in small families, women may receive more achievement and independence training, while women who do not have brothers may be a replacement for a male heir, and, thus may receive more encouragement to succeed in traditionally masculine endeavors. However, in the analysis to date, I have been unable to uncover any evidence of specific differences in socialization emphases or relationships with parents that might explain the reasons for these relationships. For example, women who do not have brothers are no closer to their fathers, and no more likely to identify with them, than are other women.

Although other family members could fill the gaps in the support structures described by career-salient women, there is little evidence of differential support or influence by siblings or extended family members among women who vary in degree of career salience. Most of these women view their parents as the most important significant others in their support network, which validates this study's emphasis on the influence of parents. Highly career-salient women are more likely than other women to feel closest to a male family member, which may indicate some tendency for them to identify more with males than with females, but this is a relatively weak relationship.

Career salience is higher in women who do not live with their parents. Again, this finding underlines the importance of independence and distancing from parental influence to the development of strong career interests in women. Where a respondent lives is unrelated to feelings of closeness to parents, so the decision to leave home does not seem to represent rejection of parents, but simply is another form of independence and self-sufficiency.[46]

Career salience is higher in women who have had contact with people from a wide variety of social backgrounds. Although a woman's own ethnic, religious, and socioeconomic background do not appear to have a direct effect on degree of career salience, general diversity of social experience seems to have a positive effect. Such experience provides opportunities for exposure to different values and life styles than those of one's own family, and for exposure to a wider variety of potential role models. The influence of such exposure provides support for the enrichment hypothesis.

---

[46] Relationship between where the subject lives and closeness to mother: F (1, 261) = .0209; and closeness to father: F (1, 241) = 1.6888.

Teachers and Other Role Models

12. Career salience is not related to the reported degree of influence of teachers and work role models on women's educational and career decisions. Although teachers are seen as influential by about one-half of the sample, for these women, unlike the respondents in other studies, there is no relationship between teacher influence and degree of career salience. It seems plausible to expect that this finding partially may be due to the fact that so many of the women in this sample who are low in career salience want to be teachers. They may identify with, and be influenced by teachers as much as, but for different reasons than, career-salient women. However, this does not seem to be the case. Although the differences are not significant, teaching aspirants actually tend to report that they have been influenced less by teachers than have women with other occupational aspirations.[47]

---

[47] Correlation between wanting to be a teacher and the influence of teachers on the decision to attend college: $r = -.1064$; and the influence of teachers on occupational choice: $r = -.0638$.

Career salience is higher in women who choose a teacher as the person they most admire. Although there is no difference in the reported degree of influence of teachers related to career salience, highly career-salient women are much more likely than other women to choose a teacher as the man or woman they most admire. So, there is a pattern of career-salient women choosing teachers as models of their ideals, even though this admiration does not seem to be translated into influence on specific decisions.

Teachers can be important significant others, and can fill the gap in the support structures available to career-salient women. However, the data indicate that, for this sample, teachers may be admired from afar, but they are viewed as relatively distant models. The sample as a whole does not seem to see teachers as very accessible as sources of advice when one is grappling with an issue of personal concern. They find it difficult to describe their teachers' views of them, and emphasize their teachers' concern with their performance of the student role.

To increase their influence, teachers have to convey to their students an interest in them as total persons, rather than just as students. Career education for women can not be successful if women do not share their noncareer goals and plans with their teachers. Reluctance to share concerns that are not directly related to academic work may result in unrealistic or lowered aspirations and more potential for role conflict.

Career-salient women also are more likely than other women to choose as models women who are competent, intelligent, ambitious, and self-assured. Although few of the women in the sample specifically mention admiration for a woman's ability to combine family and career roles, this is a concern for some of these women. Women might be more likely to consider the possibility of combining marriage and a career if they have female models available who have successfully done so. Such women should serve central roles in career education programs for women.

However, men, and specifically, male faculty members, also can serve as models and as sources of support. Although the small numbers involved did not allow for consideration of the importance of the sex of the faculty member who is chosen as a role model, over half of the admired teachers mentioned are men.

Male Peers

13. Career salience is higher in women who date relatively infrequently. This hypothesis is supported, although highly career-women are no less likely than other women to have a steady boy friend. Also, they do not seem to be worried about their lack of dates and don't seem to feel that they are unpopular with men, so one might venture to say that they date less out of choice, rather than out of lack of opportunity.

14. Career salience is not related to the reported degree of influence of male peers on women's educational and career decisions. Few of the women in the sample feel that male friends have had a significant influence on their specific educational and career choices, but the majority turn to men for general advice. As expected, these patterns are unrelated to career salience, with the exception that highly career-salient women react strongly against the implication that they can not make decisions without the help of men. Male support and attitudes are important to all of these women, which validates the contention that the expectations of male peers have special legitimacy for college-age women.

15. Career salience is higher in women who believe that their special male friends approve of their having a career. For those women who have a steady boy friend, his attitudes towards women working outside the home and his educational desires for his partner are important correlates of a woman's degree of interest in a career. Male support seems to be crucial, as a woman's perceptions of potential mates' attitudes towards her plans is a gauge of whether she will be able to meet both her marriage and career aspirations. The data on the desired characteristics of a future husband reported in Chapter V indicate that these young women seek out men who share their views about male and female roles. All of these women are aware of the crucial role male support will play in their ability to realize their aspirations, and career-salient women look for a mate who will support their having a career.

Thus, male friends can help to fill the apparent gap in the support structures of career-salient women. However, not all of the women in the sample who have strong career desires have a steady boy friend to provide this support.

Conclusion

The data on the influence of significant others on career salience in women indicate that, for this sample, it is the more independent, and somewhat socially isolated women who are more career-salient. They feel less close to, and less influenced by their parents, especially their mothers, than do other women. Still, although they may not consciously see their mothers as role models and sources of support for career aspirations, their mothers are likely to be models of fulfilled working women, who have encouraged their daughters to make their own decisions and to consider enlarging their life plans to include more than just family roles. R. Ellis and Lane (1963) suggest that upwardly mobile individuals feel ambivalence towards their parents, a description that seems to fit career-salient women as well.

Teachers fill the gaps in the support structures of career-salient women in their roles as models, but they could do much more to provide instrumental and social-emotional support for women's career aspirations. Male peers also can provide crucial support, but career-salient women date less than other women and, to the degree that men hold relatively traditional attitudes towards women's roles, it may be difficult for career-salient women to find men who will support their career aspirations.

Thus, the enrichment and deviance hypotheses both receive some support. There is some evidence that career salience is a natural outgrowth of differential socialization in the family and the result of the support of other significant others. But there also is evidence of tense family relationships and less success in heterosexual involvements among career-salient women. However, it is difficult to interpret these latter findings as evidence that career salience is a sign of maladjustment, because the career-salient women in the sample seem comfortable with their choices and do not view themselves as alienated from their parents or socially isolated, even though relative to other women, they do seem to be so. Consonant with their emphasis on individual satisfaction and achievement, they seem to relish their independence and do not seem to be bothered by the relative lack of support of significant others for their plans.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Introduction

This chapter briefly summarizes the study findings and their implications for educational policy and for further research. Two case studies of women who vary in degree of career salience are presented to further illustrate the relationships between career salience, other individual attributes, and significant other influence. The deviance and enrichment hypotheses are re-evaluated in light of the findings, and career salience is evaluated as a potential consequence of social mobility.

Summary of the Study Findings

The measure of career salience used in this study is a seven-item index that measures three definitive dimensions of career salience in women. These dimensions are 1) the degree to which a woman views work as an important, relatively continuous activity, 2) whether a woman considers work important for its intrinsic value, and the opportunities it offers for self-expression and a sense of accomplishment, and 3) the degree to which a woman considers career needs in making family decisions. Item-to-item and item-to-scale correlation analyses, and factor analysis, indicate that, for this sample, educational aspirations and various aspects of occupational choice, while correlated with degree of career salience, are not definitive components of the degree to which a woman values a career as a central activity in her future plans.

The scale reliability analyses corroborate the initial assumptions on which this study was based. Women plan a life style, not just a career. Their future plans center around trying to mesh career and family desires in an intricate balancing act in which plans for a career are evaluated relative to family plans, and vice versa. The most career-salient women assign at least equal priority to career plans and adjust family desires to meet career demands. Few of these women give up desires to marry and have children. The least career-salient women adjust career involvement aspirations to what they see as the primary demands of family roles. Some of these women see the two roles as incompatible and opt out of career commitments.

Table 32 summarizes the findings concerning the relationships between career salience and other contemporaneous attributes of the subjects. Degree of career salience is most strongly related to educational expectations, sex-typing of the occupational choice, and family plans. Except for sex role ideology, basic belief systems such as values and self-concepts do not help to explain degree of career salience as much as do specific aspects of future plans.

After completing a survey of young adult women, Pfeil (1964) bemoaned the fact that "it strikes me that most of them live without planning their lives; they do not design their lives as a whole" (p. 163). This does not seem to be the case for the women studied here. Their plans

Table 32.--Summary of the Findings Concerning the Relationship of Career Salience to Other Individual Attributes

Original Hypothesis	Accepted/Rejected	Alternative Hypotheses or Specification of Original Hypothesis
1. Career salience increases over the four years of college, with the most significant increase in career interest occurring between the junior and senior years.	Accepted with qualification	Career salience increases gradually over the four years of college, with the most significant increase in career interest occurring during the junior year.
2. Career salience is not related to actual academic achievement or ability.	Rejected	Career salience is higher among women whose academic achievement and self-ratings of ability are high.
3. Career salience is higher in women with a strong need for achievement or intellectual interests.	No adequate test	Career salience is not consistently related to a need for achievement or intellectual interests.
4. Career salience is higher among women with high educational aspirations.	Accepted	Career salience is higher among women with high educational aspirations and expectations.
5. Career salience is not related to general educational and occupational values.	Rejected	Career salience is higher in women who reject family role-related motives for attending college or choosing a job.
6. Career salience is higher among women who chose their occupational goal early in life.	Rejected	Career salience is higher among women who chose their current occupational goal during college.

Table 32.--Continued

Original Hypothesis	Accepted/Rejected	Alternative Hypotheses or Specification of Original Hypothesis
7. Career salience is not related to the prestige level of the occupational goal among college-educated women.	No adequate test	Indirect support is provided by the fact that there is a range of degree of career salience in a sample that chooses occupations that are similar in status.
8. Career salience is higher in women who choose occupations atypical for their sex.	Accepted	Career salience is lower among women who desire to be public school teachers.
9. Career salience is higher among women who have had more, and more varied, work experience.	Rejected	Career salience is not related to the amount, variety, or nature of previous work experience.
10. Career salience is higher in women with egalitarian sex role attitudes.	Accepted	
11. Career salience is higher in women who plan to delay marriage.	Accepted	
12. Career salience is higher in women who plan to delay childbearing.	Accepted	
13. Career salience is higher in women who plan to have small families.	Accepted	

Table 32.--Continued

Original Hypothesis	Accepted/Rejected	Alternative Hypotheses or Specification of Original Hypothesis
14. Career salience is higher in women who prefer an egalitarian division of roles in their own marriage.	-------	Defined as one of the components of career salience. Career salience is higher in women who place less importance on marriage. Career salience is higher in women who would not be very disappointed if they could not have children. Career salience is higher in women who do not consider physical attractiveness, a dominating personality, or success as a financial provider as necessary characteristics of a husband. Career salience is higher in women who cite personal needs as motivations that make working necessary.
15. Career salience is higher in women with positive self-concepts.	Rejected	Career salience is not related consistently to self-evaluation.
16. Career salience is higher in women who describe themselves in terms stereotyped as masculine.	Accepted with qualification	Career salience is higher in women who describe themselves as androgynous.

and attitudes are remarkably consistent for such young women.

Table 33 summarizes the findings concerning the influence of significant others, especially parents on career salience in women. For this sample, the strongest pattern is the negative relationships between closeness to parents, and perceived influence of parents and degree of career salience. In general, parents have a conservative influence, moving women away from career interests. However, working mothers who enjoy their work and are employed out of choice do serve as role models for more career-salient women. As definers, parents who support their daughter's educational aspirations and do not emphasize family roles as the only valued life goals for women also provide important support for career aspirations. For women who do not receive such support, teachers serve as important alternative role models, and male friends' support for their career desires is central.

In an attempt to "flesh out" these portraits of women who vary in degree of career salience, two case studies of women who score at the low and high ends of the range on the career salience index are presented below. It was much easier to find a "typical" case of a woman who is not career-salient than it was to find a highly career-salient women who embodies all the characteristics that seem to distinguish such women. This problem again suggests the greater individuation characteristic of women who choose an atypical route to self-fulfillment, and underscores the point that such an individual decision can be arrived at through different routes.

Table 33.--Summary of the Findings Concerning the Influence of Significant Others on Career Salience

Original Hypothesis	Accepted/Rejected	Alternative Hypotheses or Specification of Original Hypothesis
1. Career salience is higher in women who are not close to their parents, especially their mothers.	Accepted	
2. Career salience is not related to parental socioeconomic status.	Accepted	
		Career salience is higher in women whose mothers hold higher status jobs than do their husbands or who married down.
3. Career salience is higher in women whose mothers have been employed outside the home.	Accepted	
4. Career salience is higher in women whose mothers have been employed outside the home and who have enjoyed working.	Accepted	
		Career salience is higher in women whose mothers worked to fill some individual need.
		Career salience is higher in women who feel their fathers support their mothers' employment.

Table 33.--Continued

Original Hypothesis	Accepted/Rejected	Alternative Hypotheses or Specification of Original Hypothesis
		Career salience is higher in women who are glad that their mothers worked.
5. Career salience is higher in women whose parents share marital roles.	Rejected	Career salience is not related to parents' division of marital roles.
		Career salience is higher in women who report that their mothers were not very involved with them when they were young.
6. Career salience is higher in women whose parents encourage their daughter to achieve and to be independent.	Partially accepted	Career salience is not related to the degree of parental emphasis on achievement.
		Career salience is higher in women whose parents are not very protective towards them.
7. Career salience is higher in women whose parents have high educational aspirations for their daughter.	Accepted	

Table 33.--Continued

Original Hypothesis	Accepted/Rejected	Alternative Hypotheses or Specification of Original Hypotheses
8. Career salience is higher in women whose parents do not emphasize the enhancement of the performance of family roles as a reason for attending college.	Accepted	Career salience is higher in women who feel that their parents have not influenced their educational and career decisions.
9. Career salience is higher in women whose parents have egalitarian sex role attitudes.	Accepted with qualification	Career salience is higher in women whose parents, especially mothers, give them less traditional sex role advice.
10. Career salience is higher in women who were brought up in small, rather than large, families.	Accepted	
11. Career salience is not related to differential socialization based on birth order or sex of siblings.	Partially accepted	Career salience is higher in women who do not have brothers. Career salience is higher in women who do not live with their parents.

Table 33.--Continued

Original Hypothesis	Accepted/Rejected	Alternative Hypotheses or Specification of Original Hypotheses
		Career salience is higher in women who have had contact with people from a wide variety of social backgrounds.
12. Career salience is higher in women who report that teachers and work role models have influenced their educational and career decisions.	Rejected	Career salience is not related to the reported degree of influence of teachers and work role models on women's educational and career decisions.
		Career salience is higher in women who choose a teacher as the person they most admire.
13. Career salience is higher in women who date relatively infrequently.	Accepted	
14. Career salience is not related to the reported degree of influence of male peers on women's educational and career decisions.	Accepted	
15. Career salience is higher in women who believe that their special male friends approve of their having a career.	Accepted	

Linda is a sophomore at State. She has spent her entire life in one rather homogeneous neighborhood, and reports that the people she went to school with shared her background. Her father, a high school graduate, is a department manager for the telephone company. Her mother worked before marriage, but hasn't worked since, which Linda feels is because her husband did not want her to work. Linda feels closest to mother, who she describes as "kind, considerate, and devoted to her family." Her mother impressed upon her that a woman's place is in the home and that having children is a woman's greatest fulfillment.

Linda chooses her father as the man she most admires, because "he's understanding and helpful." Her father encouraged her to get an education just in case something should happen, and specifically suggested teaching as a good job for a woman. From elementary school on, Linda wanted to be an elementary school teacher, and she has never wavered from this goal.

Linda's parents have a fairly traditional marriage, although they share decision making authority. Linda's father doesn't help around the house, and neither of her parents think that a man should do so. These views also are evident in the ways they raised their son and daughter. Linda was taught from an early age that the housekeeping duties are part of the woman's role.

Linda still lives with her parents, who are paying her college expenses. She has attained a C+ average so far, and hopes to finish college, but has no desire to go further in school. Her parents and her steady boy friend, who she goes out with several times a week, share her educational desires.

Linda's view of her future is largely centered around her roles as wife and mother. She hopes to marry soon after graduation. She feels it's important that her husband be a good-looking, dominating man, who will be a good provider for her and the two children she hopes to have shortly after marriage. The marriage she envisions would, in many respects, be similar to that of her parents. She plans on working only until her children are born, and would return to work only if her husband died, was incapacitated, or was unemployed. She feels that she would have trouble combining family and work responsibilities "because of lack of sufficient time to do a job well at either." She sees her ideal marriage as characterized by segregated roles in which the wife cares for the home and the children, while the husband provides economic support for the family. She suggests that the solution to Al and Margo's conflict over who should do the dishes is rather simple: "Margo should do the dishes because she's the wife and it's her responsibility."

Her general sex role attitudes are consistent with her own plans. She affirms a belief in traditional, segregated roles for men and women in general, and reacts strongly against feminist demands for change, especially to the suggestions that women are oppressed or that the institution of marriage needs change. Her view of the women's movement is telling: "I think women have a right to a career, but certain jobs, I don't feel, are not fit for women, i.e., carpenter, construction worker. I agree with some of their movements, but not all."

Linda describes herself as "quiet," "female," "young," "willing to learn," and "eager to teach." Ideally, she would like to be "well-educated," "personable," "teaching," "artistic," and "outgoing." She does not see herself as a leader, or as someone who can express her opinions freely. She worries a lot about the future, her appearance, and whether or not people like her.

Ten years from now, Linda sees her life as centered around her family. She plans to expend her energy and gain her fulfillment from spending time with her family, keeping a comfortable home, and contributing to the well-being of others in her community.

Susan's life goals and background stand in sharp contrast to those that characterize Linda and other noncareer-salient women. She has her own apartment, and her family does not live nearby. She feels strongly that her decision to attend college was an individual decision, noting that "I got neither pressure nor encouragement from anyone."

Susan is the eldest of two girls. Her father was an elementary school graduate, employed as a delivery man. Her mother returned to school to graduate from high school at the age of 22 and previously was employed as an upholsterer.

Her parents were relatively traditional role models. Her father never helped around the house, but Susan views her mother as having more say than her father in important family decisions. Her mother worked before she had children, and seemed to enjoy working, but quit working when Susan was born.

Susan's father died when she was in junior high school. Her father was never very involved with her, and it is clear that her relationship with him was filled with tension. For example, she notes that she can't say that he disagreed with her frequently because "I never dared to disagree with him." She also does not have a very warm relationship with her mother, though she admires her because she is "a very stable, solid, good person."

After Susan's father died, her mother returned to work briefly until her maternal grandmother came to live with the family. Susan's mother was forced to quit work to care for her mother and the family began receiving welfare support. Based on her own experience, Susan's mother has emphasized that Susan needs to be able to take care of herself, and she sees a college education as a key to a better life and more security for her children. She has told her daughter that having children is a great joy, but she also feels that more women should work outside the home.

Susan attended public schools with students from a variety of social backgrounds. She was intent on becoming a nurse until her senior year in high school, when she decided she would rather be a teacher. She is now a junior at State, where she is a superior student, maintaining close to an A average. She chose State because of the low cost, and is supporting herself with the help of some financial aid. She plans on getting a masters degree in comparative education, and then hopes to teach at a junior college. She would like to obtain even more education, and to study abroad, but she feels that is an impossible dream.

While at State, she has found a special mentor, a young male faculty member who she describes as ". . . very intelligent and aware of things going on around him. Also, he is a very sensitive person. I admire the relationship he and his wife have, i.e., both of them respect each other and are sensitive to each other's needs. Also, they share jobs around the house."

College has acted to intensify Susan's interest in a career. She intends to work throughout her life, with the possible exception of when her children are very young. She feels strongly that her future husband must share her views. She has a steady boy friend back home, but she is about to break off their relationship because he views her as "not be to taken seriously (he frequently tells stories to make me appear stupid)," "filled with strange ideas (it's just a phase)," and "bound to settle down (he doesn't want me to go on to graduate school)." When asked what might happen to *necessitate* her working, Susan replies: "It isn't a matter of *having to,* other than in the sense that I never want to have my life narrowed to the four walls of a house. I don't want to get to the point where all I can talk about is my kids or housework. In that sense, I shall always 'have to' work."

Susan views her ideal marriage as completely egalitarian. She plans to wait until her late twenties to marry, and would like to have two children. She says she would not be very disappointed if she could not have children of her own, because she would be happy to adopt. When she is 30, Susan hopes she will be contributing to the support of her family through her own job and spending time on other personal interests.

A Re-evaluation of the Deviance and Enrichment Hypotheses

Are women like Susan deviant or just different? Are women like Linda well-adjusted because their lives are centered on family, the core of the normative female role? Certainly, the emphasis on career goals, and the supporting sex role conceptions, family plans, and educational ambitions of the career-salient women in this sample are unusual, for women, and especially for less advantaged women. But this survey uncovered no evidence that degree of career salience is associated with happiness, self-evaluation, or degree of role conflict. Whether they are strongly career-salient or have little interest in a career, these women seem comfortable with their choices and are well-adjusted, if adjustment is defined as consistency between plans, attitudes, values, and self-concepts.

Only a handful of the most career-salient women have chosen to give up marriage or parenthood aspirations in order to give complete attention to their careers. More commonly, career-salient women add a career to the core family roles, and hope to deal with potential conflict by redefining the necessary requirements of family roles, reducing their family involvements somewhat, and sharing family roles more with their spouses. It actually is the noncareer-salient women who are denying themselves something--the opportunity to have an independent life outside the home.

Although these women may be well-adjusted to their current choices, one must still deal with the suggestion that strong career desires in women initially may be compensation for rejection by significant others. For this sample, there is a definite tendency for career-salient women to feel more distant from, and to have less warm relationships with their parents, especially their mothers, than do other women. They do not choose their mothers as models, and since typically these women's mothers are full time homemakers or reluctant working women, strong career interests may be a reaction against their mothers' life styles. But there also is evidence that the mothers of career-salient women encouraged their daughters' independence and did not encourage them to make decisions based on the assumption that family roles are central to the female role. For this sample, parental influence predictive of career salience seems to be a combination of a dose of rejection, particularly maternal rejection, mixed with less emphasis on traditional female role expectations.

While less career-salient women choose their parents as role models, strongly career-salient women look elsewhere, with teachers often serving as models of the life styles to which they aspire. The data do support the suggestion in the enrichment hypothesis that career salience grows out of exposure to a wider variety of potential role models and a willingness to go outside the family for sources of support. Career-salient women do seem to be less successful in their relationships with males, as measured by dating frequency, but this is as much due to the fact that career-salient women are looking for atypical men who will support their aspirations, as it is evidence that their career aspirations are compensation for their lack of heterosexual involvement.

The problem with the deviance hypothesis is its assumption that negative experiences must have negative consequences. For career-salient women, conflictful family experiences and fewer opportunities to depend on men lead to the development of autonomy and personal strength.

Implications of the Study Findings for Educational Policy

In this sample, degree of career salience increases during the college years. The majority of these women feel that their interest in a career and their educational aspirations have increased since entering college. This cross-sectional pattern is corroborated by longitudinal panel data (Angrist and Almquist, 1975). It appears that the college years are an important time for sorting out future career and family involvements. Decisions as to the place a career will play in one's future plans are not set, but the imminence of real career and family decisions makes women open to influence at this point. The most significant increase in degree of career salience occurs during the junior year, when important family and educational commitments also are reassessed.

Although the college experience seems to heighten interest in a career, and teachers are viewed as important role models by career-salient women, there are a number of ways colleges could increase their influence and help all women, regardless of their goals, to make realistic future plans. To briefly summarize, the study findings suggest that, in colleges serving a nonelite study body, the following types of intervention would provide effective support for women's career planning.

1) A career education program for women must encourage life style planning, not just career planning. Women need help in judging the realism of their career plans given their family plans, and vice versa. They should be encouraged to define their family and career role expectations and to redefine those expectations that limit

their ability to realize other life goals.

2) Teachers can serve as important models and definers of women's ability and opportunities. Career-salient women in particular need the support of teachers, as they do not receive adequate instrumental or social-emotional support from their parents. Teachers could better fill their roles if they conveyed to students an interest in all aspects of their plans. These women see their teachers as admirable, but rather distant and unapproachable, a feeling that may be common among female college students (Dickerson, 1974).

3) Women especially need contact with teachers and other female role models who have combined family and career, and who could help them assess the adjustments necessary to successfully do both. Contact with men who participate actively in family roles and who value women's competence also can provide needed support.

4) Consideration of women's issues in the curriculum can affect sex role attitudes and would be one mechanism for changing the attitudes of men, whose support is crucial to a woman's ability to maintain strong interest in a career.

5) The women in this sample need more specific advice concerning graduate school options. Their plans are very indefinite and a number of women have higher aspirations than expectations, which may represent a significant talent loss.

6) The occupational choices of these women are very limited, with the majority choosing one of the female-dominated, lesser professions. These choices, especially the dominant interest in teaching, are not

realistic given the current employment picture. Occupational choice seems to be set for most of these women long before college. Intervention as early as the elementary grades is necessary. Girls need to be encouraged to develop all of their abilities and need exposure to a wide variety of potential careers. At the college level, offering a wider variety of nontraditional majors and making it easier to change one's major might widen choices. Also, educational institutions need to improve their long range labor market forecasting, and provide women with information about their employment chances early and systematically before other options are closed.

Suggestions for Further Research

This report provides but a profile of the sources and correlates of career salience in college women from nonelite backgrounds. There still is much that needs to be done with the data collected for this study and in new studies.

The analysis reported here has focussed on correlation, not prediction. Much more could be reported about the relationships among the various independent variables, and the effects of family experience on dependent variables other than career salience, as part of developing a causal model. A more important issue is whether measured career salience during college has any utility for predicting actual career involvement. I have noted that women's attitudes about the relative importance of career and family begin to coalesce during the college years. But there are still a lot of contingencies to be faced in adulthood that may affect whether a woman is able to carry out her desired plans. These women seem to be "planners," but Ginzberg and Yohalem (1966) note that among adult women, one also encounters "recasters," "adapters," and the "unsettled." Only a longitudinal study that follows these women into adulthood can determine to what degree their aspirations predict their actual life styles, and to what degree a woman can foresee and plan for the circumstances that affect her actual career involvement.

Some of the potential correlates of career salience did not receive enough attention in this study, or the measures used were not adequate. Need for achievement and parents' emphasis on achievement deserve more attention. These attitudes, as well as the whole area of parents' socialization emphases, are difficult to measure with closed-ended questionnaire items. Projective measures of need for achievement and conversational interviews with daughters and with parents might better delineate important differences.

The differential socialization model of the sources of career salience needs to be tested by other researchers studying more heterogeneous samples. Although this model was relatively ineffective in explaining parental influence on career salience for this sample, the data suggest that it might have more explanatory power in a study of upper-middle-class women, whose parents have the resources to be positive models of a career-salient life style.

Researchers also need to pay much more attention to women's family plans if they want to understand women's career decisions. Researchers seem to have assumed that women do not plan their future family involvement the way they do their career choices. This study indicates that one can predict more about a woman's degree of interest in a career by looking at her family plans than by any other criterion.

Career Salience as a Potential Consequence of Social Mobility

Strong career salience, in which a career is viewed as equal in priority to family roles, is not typical for this group of predominantly working-class and lower-middle-class women. The more typical life pattern desired is the sequential pattern followed by many women of the past generation, in which family responsibilities take priority, but one has the education and skills necessary to work when family security demands it, and has the possibility of a future career when children are grown. For many of these women, being able to choose to stay at home will be a sign of upward mobility.

For the minority of highly career-salient women, their strong interests in a career also seem to be a logical consequence of their mobility. I am struck by the parallels between the descriptions of the career-salient women in this sample and descriptions of upwardly mobile individuals in the literature.[1] In both cases, we see that high aspirations are stimulated by parents, especially mothers, who want their children to have a better life than they had. Parents can not give effective direction to the aspirations they inspire, because of their lack of knowledge about educational and occupational requirements, so their children turn to others, especially teachers, for this direction.

---

[1] See for example, Douvan and Kaye (1962), Dynes et al. (1956) R. Ellis and Lane (1963), Kahl (1953), Krauss (1964), Merton (1957), Strodtbeck (1958), and R. Turner (1964a).

This necessity to turn to outside adults, and the inability of parents to serve as positive models, leads to less dependence on the family, and ambivalent feelings towards parents and the values they represent.

The college experience serves to build on and heighten the aspirations that parents initially inspired. In the case of career-salient women, parental desires are taken to their logical extreme. The college education that parents hoped for becomes their daughter's graduate school aspirations. The good job they want her to obtain becomes the career from which she hopes to gain primary satisfaction. While these parents may no longer recognize their daughter's aspirations, I believe they planted the seeds.

APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE

A Study of the Future Plans of Women College Students

Dear Student,

This questionnaire is part of a study of the future plans and aspirations of women college students. I am conducting this study for my doctoral dissertation. I hope you will help me out by taking the time to answer the questions.

Your responses to this questionnaire are confidential. All reporting of the results of this study will be on a group basis. No individuals will be identified, and no one other than me, on this campus or elsewhere, will see the individual questionnaires.

The only place you should identify yourself is by writing your IBM number at the bottom of this page. This sheet will be detached from the questionnaire. I have asked for this identification because for the second stage of the study, to be conducted next fall, a small random sample of women who answered questionnaires will be invited to meet with me individually for an interview.

Instructions for each question are given in the body of the questionnaire. Most questions can be answered by checking a blank. There are no right or wrong answers. Please complete the questions in the order they are presented. Please answer every question. If the answer you would like to give is not listed, please write in your response. Do not discuss or show the questionnaire to anyone else; I am interested in your opinion.

It is very important that you complete this questionnaire. If I do not receive responses from all women chosen for the sample, the validity of the study results will be impaired. If you are interested in finding out more about this study, or if there are questions that are unclear, please come to see me any time in E201.

Yours truly,

Mary J. Guttmacher
Instructor in Education

IBM Identification Number: ____________

1. Age: ____________ 2. Graduating class: ______________

3. Marital status: ___ Single ___ Married

___ Divorced or separated

4. Do you have children? ___ Yes ___ No

IF YOU HAVE CHILDREN:
a. What are their ages? ______________

5. Religion: ___ Catholic
___ Protestant
___ Jewish
___ Other (specify): ____________________

6. Nationality background (e.g., Irish, Italian, etc.);

On your mother's side: __________________________

On your father's side: __________________________

7. In your family, which generation immigrated to the United States?

	On your mother's side	On your father's side
a. Your generation	a. ___	a. ___
b. Parents	b. ___	b. ___
c. Grandparents	c. ___	c. ___
d. Great-grandparents	d. ___	d. ___
e. Great-great grandparents	e. ___	e. ___
f. Don't know	f. ___	f. ___

8. Number of older brothers: ______________

Number of younger brothers: ______________

Number of older sisters: ______________

Number of younger sisters: ______________

9. Where are you currently living? ___ With my parents
___ In a dormitory
___ In an apartment
___ In my own home
___ Other (specify): ______________

SINGLE WOMEN:

10. How often do you date?
___ Three or more times a week
___ Once or twice a week
___ Once or twice a month
___ Almost never

11. Do you have a steady boy friend? ___ Yes ___ No

12. Are you engaged? ___ Yes ___ No

13. Proposed academic major: ______________________________

14. Proposed second area of concentration and/or minors:

____

15. What sorts of schools did you attend during most of your elementary and high school years? Check those that apply.

		Elementary	High School
a. 1) Public	a. 1)	___	___
2) Parochial	2)	___	___
3) Private (non-sectarian)	3)	___	___
b. 1) Co-educational	b. 1)	___	___
2) All-girls	2)	___	___

16. Were the other students in the schools you attended during most of your elementary and high school years similar or different than you in terms of the following characteristics?

	Elementary		High School	
	Same	Different	Same	Different
a. Religion	___	___	___	___
b. Nationality	___	___	___	___
c. Family income	___	___	___	___

17. When you were in elementary school, if someone had asked you, "What do you want to be when you grow up?", what would you have answered?

____

18. When you were in high school, if someone had asked you, "What do you want to be?", what would you have answered?

____

19. Indicate which of the following people had a lot of influence on your decision to go to college by putting a "1" by the person who was the most influential, a "2" by the person who was quite influential, and a "3" by the person who was somewhat influential.

___ Guidance counselor
___ Boy friend(s) or husband
___ Father
___ Mother
___ Teacher(s)
___ Girl friend(s)
___ Other relatives
___ Other (specify): ______________________

20. Why do you want to attend college? Indicate how important each reason listed below is to you by checking the appropriate column.

		Very	Somewhat	Not very	Not at all	
a. To become a well-rounded person.	a.	___	___	___	___	a.
b. To learn more about myself.	b.	___	___	___	___	b.
c. To be a good companion for my husband.	c.	___	___	___	___	c.
d. To please my parents.	d.	___	___	___	___	d.
e. To get a good job.	e.	___	___	___	___	e.
f. To be a good mother to my children.	f.	___	___	___	___	f.
g. To gain prestige, higher status.	g.	___	___	___	___	g.
h. To learn a skill just in case I have to work.	h.	___	___	___	___	h.
i. To be exposed to new ideas.	i.	___	___	___	___	i.
j. To learn to get along with others.	j.	___	___	___	___	j.

21. Why does your mother want you to attend college? Indicate how important you think each reason listed below is to her by checking the appropriate column.

		Very	Somewhat	Not very	Not at all	
a. To become a well-rounded person.	a.	___	___	___	___	a.
b. To learn more about yourself.	b.	___	___	___	___	b.
c. To be a good companion for your husband.	c.	___	___	___	___	c.
d. To please your parents.	d.	___	___	___	___	d.
e. To get a good job.	e.	___	___	___	___	e.
f. To be a good mother to your children.	f.	___	___	___	___	f.
g. To gain prestige, higher status.	g.	___	___	___	___	g.
h. To learn a skill just in case you have to work.	h.	___	___	___	___	h.
i. To be exposed to new ideas.	i.	___	___	___	___	i.
j. To learn to get along with others.	j.	___	___	___	___	j.

22. Why does your father want you to attend college? Indicate how important you think each reason listed below is to him by checking the appropriate column.

		Very	Somewhat	Not very	Not at all	
a. To become a well-rounded person.	a.	___	___	___	___	a.
b. To learn more about yourself.	b.	___	___	___	___	b.
c. To be a good companion for your husband.	c.	___	___	___	___	c.
d. To please your parents.	d.	___	___	___	___	d.
e. To get a good job.	e.	___	___	___	___	e.
f. To be a good mother to your children.	f.	___	___	___	___	f.
g. To gain prestige, higher status.	g.	___	___	___	___	g.
h. To learn a skill just in case you have to work.	h.	___	___	___	___	h.
i. To be exposed to new ideas.	i.	___	___	___	___	i.
j. To learn to get along with others.	j.	___	___	___	___	j.

23. Did you graduate from high school in:

___ the top 10 percent of my class
___ the top 25 percent of my class
___ the top 50 percent of my class
___ the bottom 50 percent of my class

24. What were your SAT aptitude scores?

	Verbal	Math
700's	___	___
600's	___	___
500's	___	___
400's	___	___
300's	___	___

25. Why did you decide to come to LSC rather than going to another college? Indicate how important each of the reasons listed below was by checking the appropriate column.

			Very	Somewhat	Not very	Not at all	
a.	Quality of the school	a.	___	___	___	___	a.
b.	Low cost	b.	___	___	___	___	b.
c.	Only place I was accepted	c.	___	___	___	___	c.
d.	Within commuting distance	d.	___	___	___	___	d.
e.	Wanted to stay near home	e.	___	___	___	___	e.
f.	Academic record	f.	___	___	___	___	f.
g.	Friends going here	g.	___	___	___	___	g.
h.	Offered program I wanted	h.	___	___	___	___	h.
i.	Parents wanted LSC	i.	___	___	___	___	i.

26. Who is paying the major portion of your direct school expenses (e.g., tuition, books, etc.)?

___ Me
___ My parents
___ Other relatives or family friends
___ A scholarship or other financial aid
___ Other (specify): ____________________

27. How much education would you like to obtain?

___ Some college, but less than four years
___ Graduation from a four-year college
___ Extra courses in graduate school, but not towards a degree

___ A Masters degree in: ________________

___ A doctorate (or M.D., LL.B.) in: ________________

28. How much education would your mother, father, and, if applicable, boy friend or husband like you to obtain?

	Mother	Father	Boy friend or husband
Some college, but less than four years	___	___	___
Graduation from a four-year college	___	___	___
Extra courses in graduate school, but not towards a degree	___	___	___
A Masters degree	___	___	___
A doctorate (or M.D., LL.B.)	___	___	___

29. How much education do you expect you will really be able to obtain?
___ Some college, but less than four years
___ Graduation from a four-year college
___ Extra courses in graduate school, but not towards a degree

___ A Masters degree in: ____________________

___ A doctorate (or M.D., LL.B.) in: ____________________

IF YOU EXPECT TO GO TO GRADUATE SCHOOL:
a. When do you plan to go to graduate school?
___ Immediately after college, full time
___ Immediately after college, part time while working
___ Plan to wait awhile
___ Not sure yet

IF YOU PLAN TO WAIT A WHILE TO GO TO GRADUATE SCHOOL:
1) Why don't you plan to go to graduate school right away?

30. What job would you most like to obtain when you finish your education?

____

31. What job do you expect you will really be able to obtain?

____

32. Indicate which of the following people have influenced your job choice by putting a "1" by the person who was the most influential, a "2" by the person who was quite influential, and a "3" by the person who was somewhat influential.

___ Teacher(s)
___ Father
___ Boy friend(s) or husband
___ Mother
___ Girl friend(s)
___ Other relatives
___ Other people who work at the job
___ Other (specify): ____________________________

33. Below is a list of characteristics a job might have. Indicate how important each characteristic is to you as a requirement for the ideal job by checking the appropriate column.

			Very	Somewhat	Not very	Not at all	
a.	Provides opportunities for advancement.	a.	___	___	___	___	a.
b.	Be my own boss.	b.	___	___	___	___	b.
c.	Involves clean, nonphysical activity.	c.	___	___	___	___	c.
d.	Opportunity to use my special abilities.	d.	___	___	___	___	d.
e.	Have friendly coworkers.	e.	___	___	___	___	e.
f.	Chance to earn a lot of money.	f.	___	___	___	___	f.
g.	Hours that fit well with home responsibilities.	g.	___	___	___	___	g.
h.	Provides a stable, secure future.	h.	___	___	___	___	h.
i.	Opportunity to work with people rather than things.	i.	___	___	___	___	i.
j.	Give me social status and prestige.	j.	___	___	___	___	j.
k.	Easy to return to after child rearing.	k.	___	___	___	___	k.
l.	Permit me to be creative and original.	l.	___	___	___	___	l.
m.	Opportunity to help others.	m.	___	___	___	___	m.
n.	Not have to take my job home with me.	n.	___	___	___	___	n.
o.	Use my mind.	o.	___	___	___	___	o.
p.	Have a lot of responsibility.	p.	___	___	___	___	p.

34. What jobs have you had in the past four years?

35. What has been your most interesting job?

____

36. At what times in your life do you expect to have a paying job? Check all that apply.
___ Before I marry
___ After marriage, before I have children
___ Before my youngest child is in school
___ While my youngest child is in elementary school
___ While my youngest child is in high school
___ After my youngest child leaves high school

37. If you did not have to work (if your husband earns a lot of money, for instance), when would you really like to work? Check all that apply.
___ Before I marry
___ After marriage, before I have children
___ Before my youngest child is in school
___ While my youngest child is in elementary school
___ While my youngest child is in high school
___ After my youngest child leaves high school

38. For what reasons would you ever work outside the home?

39. If you marry (or are married), do you think you will have any trouble combining work outside the home with responsibilities in the home?
___ No, because:

___ Yes, because:

40. Some people believe that most women who work don't have to work. Do you believe that you might ever have to work? ___ Yes ___ No
IF YES:
a. What might happen that would necessitate your working?

41. Please complete the following statements, using five descriptive words or phrases.

a. I am:
1)
2)
3)
4)
5)

b. I will be:
1)
2)
3)
4)
5)

c. Ideally, I would like to be:
1)
2)
3)
4)
5)

42. SINGLE WOMEN:

a. Do you want to get married? ___ Yes ___ No

b. How important is marriage to you?
___ Extremely important
___ Very important
___ Quite important
___ Not very important

43. IF YOU WANT TO MARRY OR ARE MARRIED:

a. How old would you like to be (or were you) when you marry? ____

b. How important will each of the following qualities be (or how important were they) in your choice of a future husband? Check the appropriate column.

		Very	Somewhat	Not very	Not at all	
1) Is good-looking	1)	___	___	___	___	1)
2) Has a professional job	2)	___	___	___	___	2)
3) Is sensitive	3)	___	___	___	___	3)
4) Wants his wife to have a career	4)	___	___	___	___	4)
5) Is ambitious	5)	___	___	___	___	5)
6) Has interests similar to mine	6)	___	___	___	___	6)
7) Will be a good provider	7)	___	___	___	___	7)
8) Is dominating	8)	___	___	___	___	8)
9) Is college-educated	9)	___	___	___	___	9)
10) Will be a good father	10)	___	___	___	___	10)

c. In your view of the ideal marriage, who would participate in the family activities listed below? Indicate how much responsibility the wife and husband would have in each area by circling the number that corresponds to your view.

1 = has the major responsibility
2 = helps out on a regular basis
3 = responsibility shared equally
4 = helps out sometimes
5 = never does this

		Wife	Husband
1) Plays with the children	1)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2) Keeps the house clean	2)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3) Manages the money	3)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4) Cares for the children (e.g., feeding, bathing)	4)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5) Makes decisions about the children's schooling	5)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6) Provides economic support for the family	6)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7) Washes the dishes	7)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8) Makes decisions about major purchases	8)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9) Punishes the children	9)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10) Takes care of the yard	10)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

44. Do you want to have children? ___ Yes ___ No

45. IF YOU WANT TO HAVE CHILDREN:

a. How old would you like to be (or were you) when you have your first child?

____

b. How many children would you like to have? ________

c. List below the three characteristics you would most like your daughters to have.

1)

2)

3)

d. List below the three characteristics you would most like your sons to have.

1)

2)

3)

e. How disappointed would you be if you could not have children?

___ Extremely disappointed
___ Very disappointed
___ Quite disappointed
___ Not very disappointed

46, Today, women are involved in many activities, but it is difficult for us to find time to do all we would like to do. Think about what you would like your life to be like when you are 30 years old. Put a check next to the three activities that will be the most important to you at that time of your life.

___ Being able to advance to a position of authority in my job.
___ Spending a lot of time with my family.
___ Being involved in clubs and volunteer activities.
___ Contributing to the financial support of my family.
___ Spending time on hobbies, sports, and other personal interests.
___ Having a job outside the home.
___ Making a contribution to the well-being of others in my community.
___ Keeping my home clean and comfortable.

47. What [illegible] other people think you are like? Please complete the following sentences, using five descriptive words or phrases.

a. My parents think I am:

1)

2)

3)

4)

5)

b. My favorite teacher thinks I am:

1)

2)

3)

4)

5)

c. My boy friend (or husband) thinks I am:

1)

2)

3)

4)

5)

48. Does your father live with your family?
___ Yes
___ No, he is deceased
___ No, he is divorced or separated
___ No, because ____________________

49. What is your father's occupation? (If you have a step-father or foster father, tell about him)

____

50. During most of your life, how much did your father work?

___ Full time
___ Part time
___ Irregularly

51. Has your father been unemployed or laid off? ___ Yes ___ No

52. Does your mother live with your family?
___ Yes
___ No, she is deceased
___ No, she is divorced or separated
___ No, because ____________________

53. How far did your parents go in school?

Father	Mother	
___	___	Graduated from elementary school
___	___	Some high school, but did not graduate
___	___	Graduated from high school
___	___	Technical, nursing, or business school after high school
___	___	Some college, but less than four years
___	___	Graduated from a four-year college
___	___	Attended graduate or professional school after college
___	___	Don't know

54. Does anyone else, other than you, your parents, and brothers and sisters under 18 live in your family's house? ___ Yes ___ No
IF YES:
a. Who is that? (e.g., older brother, grandmother, a boarder, etc.)

____

55. IF YOU ARE MARRIED:

a. How far did your husband go in school?

___ Graduated from elementary school
___ Some high school, but did not graduate
___ Graduated from high school
___ Technical, nursing, or business school after high school
___ Some college, but less than four years
___ Graduated from a four-year college
___ Attended graduate school or professional school after college

b. What is your husband's occupation? ______________________

56. At what times in her life did your mother work? Check any that apply and tell what her job was and whether she worked full time or part time, if you know.

				Job	Full time	Part time	
a.	___	Before she married	a.	____________	___	___	a.
b.	___	After she married, before she had children	b.	____________	___	___	b.
c.	___	Before you were in school	c.	____________	___	___	c.
d.	___	While you were in elementary school	d.	____________	___	___	d.
e.	___	While you were in high school	e.	____________	___	___	e.
f.	___	At the present time	f.	____________	___	___	f.

57. IF YOUR MOTHER HAS EVER WORKED:
   a. Why do you think your mother works (worked) outside the home?

   b. How does (did) your mother feel about working?
      ___ She enjoys it.
      ___ She would prefer not to, but it has some advantages.
      ___ She hates it, but feels she has to work.

   c. How does (did) your father feel about her working?
      ___ He is glad she works.
      ___ He would prefer she didn't work, but it has some advantages.
      ___ He feels it's up to her.
      ___ He always complains about her working.

   d. How do (did) you feel about your mother working?
      ___ I am glad she works.
      ___ I would prefer she didn't work, but it has some advantages.
      ___ I feel it's up to her.
      ___ I wish she didn't work.

58. Where do most of your close relatives live?
   ___ In the same neighborhood as my family
   ___ In a different neighborhood in the same town
   ___ In the same area of the state
   ___ In another area of the state
   ___ In other states
   ___ In another country

59. During most of your life, where did you live?
   ___ The same neighborhood where my family lives now
   ___ The same town, but in different neighborhood(s)
   ___ The same state, but in different town(s)
   ___ Another state
   ___ Another country
   ___ We moved around a lot so I didn't live any one place very long

60. If you think of the neighborhood where you lived most of your life, would you say that most of your neighbors were similar or different than your family in terms of the following characteristics?

	Same	Different
Religion	___	___
Nationality	___	___
Amount of money	___	___

61. What did your grandfathers do for a living?

On your mother's side: ________________________ ___ Don't know

On your father's side: ________________________ ___ Don't know

62. Do any members of your family, including relatives or family friends you are close to, have a college degree? ___ Yes ___ No
IF YES:
a. Who are they? (e.g., aunt, brother, godmother, etc.)

____

63. In which of the following social class groups would you place your family?

___ Lower class
___ Working class
___ Middle class
___ Upper middle class
___ Upper class

64. During your childhood, in which of the following activities did your parents want you, your sister(s), and your brother(s) to participate? Circle the number that corresponds to the strength of your parents' emphasis on this activity as something each of you should do.

1 = stressed strongly
2 = stressed quite a bit
3 = not stressed very much
4 = not stressed at all

		Me	Sister(s)	Brother(s)	
a. Keeping own room clean	a.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	a.
b. Helping keep up the yard	b.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	b.
c. Having lots of girl friends	c.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	c.
d. Showing control over emotions	d.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	d.
e. Helping with the dishes, ironing	e.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	e.
f. Playing house	f.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	f.
g. Fighting our own battles	g.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	g.
h. Being a leader in club activities	h.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	h.
i. Having lots of boy friends	i.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	i.
j. Taking care of younger children	j.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	j.
k. Spending free time near home	k.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	k.
l. Doing well in sports	l.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	l.
m. Doing well in school	m.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	m.

65. Which of your parents are you the most like? ___ Mother ___ Father
a. In what ways are you like that parent?

66. Which of your parents do you wish to be like? ___ Mother ___ Father
a. Why do you wish to be like that parent?

67. Which of the following statements best describe your parents. Circle the number that corresponds with your view of how characteristic each description is of your mother and your father.

1 = very true
2 = somewhat true
3 = uncertain how true
4 = not very true
5 = not at all true

		Mother	Father
a. Helped me with my school work.	a.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
b. Is beginning to be concerned about who I will marry.	b.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
c. Thinks men should help around the house.	c.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
d. Decides on restrictions for me now.	d.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
e. Makes the major decisions in our family.	e.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
f. Insists on high academic achievement for me.	f.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
g. Is lenient with me.	g.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
h. Gets the final say when there is a disagreement.	h.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
i. Understands me.	i.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
j. Handles the money in our house.	j.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
k. Disagrees with me frequently.	k.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
l. Played with me when I was little.	l.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
m. Wants me to be popular.	m.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
n. Punished me when I was little.	n.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
o. Is often dissatisfied with what I do.	o.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
p. Listens to my ideas and opinions.	p.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
q. Worries when I'm not home on time.	q.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
r. Considers me the favorite.	r.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
s. Thinks more women should work outside the home.	s.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
t. Is protective toward me.	t.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

68. How often does your father engage in the following activities? Check the appropriate column.

		Quite often	Rarely
a. Taking out the garbage	a.	___	___
b. Washing dishes	b.	___	___
c. Making home repairs	c.	___	___
d. Cooking	d.	___	___
e. Grocery shopping	e.	___	___
f. House cleaning	f.	___	___

69. Check any of the statements below that sound like advice your parents have given you, indicating whether you got this advice from your mother, your father, or both.

Mother	Father	
___	___	a. Get a good education so you can have a better life than we had.
___	___	b. Put money away for a rainy day.
___	___	c. A woman's place is in the home.
___	___	d. No man will marry you if you're not a virgin.
___	___	e. Be prepared to take care of yourself.
___	___	f. Teaching is a good job for a woman.
___	___	g. Pretend to be interested in what your date likes to do.
___	___	h. A woman needs more than housework and a family to feel useful.
___	___	i. Get yourself an education, just in case something happens.
___	___	j. Find a man who will provide for you.
___	___	k. Having children is a woman's greatest fulfillment.

70. Of all the people in your family, to whom would you say you are closest?

____

71. If you have a serious problem, who do you go to for advice?

			Quite Often	Rarely
a.	Mother	a.	___	___
b.	Brother	b.	___	___
c.	Father	c.	___	___
d.	Boy friend(s) or husband	d.	___	___
e.	College teacher(s)	e.	___	___
f.	Girl friend(s)	f.	___	___
g.	Sister	g.	___	___
h.	Minister	h.	___	___
i.	Other (specify):__________	i.	___	___

72. Please name one woman you particularly admire. If she is a famous person, give her name. If she is a personal acquaintance, give her relationship to you (e.g., aunt, teacher, best friend, etc.).

____

a. What do you admire about her?

73. Please name one man you particularly admire. If he is a famous person, give his name. If he is a personal acquaintance, give his relationship to you (e.g., uncle, college professor, boy friend, etc.).

____

a. What do you admire about him?

74. Indicate how true each of the characteristics listed below is of you by circling the number that corresponds to your view.

1 = very true of me
2 = somewhat true of me
3 = uncertain how true of me
4 = not very true of me
5 = not at all true of me

1 2 3 4 5 a. Am good at school work
1 2 3 4 5 b. Am a leader in most groups
1 2 3 4 5 c. Lately, am often depressed
1 2 3 4 5 d. Don't speak up in class
1 2 3 4 5 e. Need to have people around to be happy
1 2 3 4 5 f. Am pretty
1 2 3 4 5 g. Want to get ahead in life
1 2 3 4 5 h. Often feel I can't control what happens to me
1 2 3 4 5 i. Am too emotional
1 2 3 4 5 j. Like to compete with others
1 2 3 4 5 k. Worry about my appearance
1 2 3 4 5 l. Rely on my boy friend (or male friends) for advice
1 2 3 4 5 m. Am popular with boys
1 2 3 4 5 n. Take things as they come
1 2 3 4 5 o. Express my ideas strongly
1 2 3 4 5 p. Sometimes hide my intelligence when I'm on a date
1 2 3 4 5 q. Worry a lot about the future
1 2 3 4 5 r. Am afraid people won't like me
1 2 3 4 5 s. Usually don't say anything when I'm insulted by someone
1 2 3 4 5 t. Have many friends in college
1 2 3 4 5 u. Am often to blame when I break up with a guy
1 2 3 4 5 v. When I was younger, I sometimes wished I were a boy

75. At the end of first term exams, Anne finds herself at the top of her medical school class.

a. Describe Anne:

b. How does she feel?

c. What will happen to her in the future?

76. Al and Margo are married, and both work full time. Al is an insurance salesman and Margo is an elementary school teacher. Margo has had parent conferences all day. Al has had a hectic day too, and is tired. He had promised to do the supper dishes, but he just doesn't feel like it. He asks Margo to do them. What should Margo do and why?

77. Joyce has made arrangements to go to the movies on Saturday night with Helen, a good friend from her dorm floor. Then on Friday, Pete, a guy she has wanted to date, asks her to go to the movies with him. What should Joyce do and why?

78. Mr. Brown and Mrs. Johnson are both store clerks. Mr. Brown has five children, and his wife stays home to take care of them. Mrs. Johnson is married to a successful real estate broker. Mrs. Johnson complains to the store manager that Mr. Brown makes more money than she does, and asks for a raise. What should the store manager do and why?

79. Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about women and men in our society by circling the number that corresponds with your view.

1 = agree strongly
2 = agree somewhat
3 = uncertain
4 = disagree somewhat
5 = disagree strongly

1 2 3 4 5 a. The best way a wife can help her husband in his work is for her to find out as much as she can about it.
1 2 3 4 5 b. Raising children is more a mother's job than a father's job.
1 2 3 4 5 c. A man's major life satisfaction comes from his career.
1 2 3 4 5 d. A woman should not take a job where she will earn more than her husband.
1 2 3 4 5 e. One of the most important things a mother can do for her daughter is to prepare her for the duties of being a wife.
1 2 3 4 5 f. Except in special cases, the wife should do the cooking and housekeeping, and the husband should provide the family with money.
1 2 3 4 5 g. A mother should stay at home while her children are below school age.
1 2 3 4 5 h. A woman's major life satisfaction comes from making her husband and children happy.
1 2 3 4 5 i. A married woman, as well as her husband, has the duty of earning a living for the family.
1 2 3 4 5 j. Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large, the husband should have the main say-so in family matters.
1 2 3 4 5 k. A wife can best help her husband in his work by providing a comfortable environment for him to come home to.
1 2 3 4 5 l. If a man is working to support his family, his wife has no right to expect him to help with housekeeping when at home.
1 2 3 4 5 m. Men don't like women who do things better than they do.
1 2 3 4 5 n. An important quality of a best girl friend is the ability to keep a secret.
1 2 3 4 5 o. My boy friend(s) (or husband) expects his wife to stay at home and look after her family, rather than to lead an independent life outside the home.

80. How would you rank your academic ability compared to the average student at this college?
___ Superior
___ Above average
___ Average
___ Somewhat below average
___ Way below average

81. How important is it to you to do well in college?
___ Very important
___ Somewhat important
___ Not very important
___ Not at all important

82. What is your current grade point average, overall and in your academic major?

	Overall	Academic major
3.5 or above	___	___
3.0 to 3.4	___	___
2.5 to 2.9	___	___
2.0 to 2.4	___	___
1.5 to 1.9	___	___
Below 1.5	___	___

83. People often find they change a lot during college. Indicate which of the following describe ways in which you've changed since you entered college by circling the number that corresponds to your view.

1 = very true of me
2 = somewhat true of me
3 = uncertain how true of me
4 = not very true of me
5 = not at all true of me

1 2 3 4 5 a. I have become more liberal in my political views.
1 2 3 4 5 b. I have changed my career plans drastically.
1 2 3 4 5 c. I have become more liberal in my views about premarital sex.
1 2 3 4 5 d. I have become more cyncial about the value of an education.
1 2 3 4 5 e. I have become more alienated from my parents.
1 2 3 4 5 f. I want to continue my education past college now.
1 2 3 4 5 g. I have become more interested in having a good time now and letting the future take care of itself.
1 2 3 4 5 h. I have begun to understand my parents better.
1 2 3 4 5 i. I have become more strongly committed to having a career.
1 2 3 4 5 j. I've learned to enjoy learning for its own sake.
1 2 3 4 5 k. I have become more concerned with future marriage plans and less concerned with career plans.

84. Some possible changes in our society that would affect the positions of women and men are listed below. Indicate whether you agree or disagree with these statements by circling the number that corresponds with your view.

1 = agree strongly
2 = agree somewhat
3 = uncertain
4 = disagree somewhat
5 = disagree strongly

1 2 3 4 5 a. More men should enter what are now women's jobs, for example, be secretaries and nurses.
1 2 3 4 5 b. If men are going to be drafted into the Army, then women should be drafted too.
1 2 3 4 5 c. More women should hold positions of leadership in government and the professions.
1 2 3 4 5 d. Men and women should have equal rights and duties in marriage.
1 2 3 4 5 e. Birth control information and devices should be available to all women.
1 2 3 4 5 f. The institution of marriage as we know it should be abolished.
1 2 3 4 5 g. Women need to organize in groups with other women if they want to obtain equal rights.
1 2 3 4 5 h. More men should stay home and take care of the children while women go to work.
1 2 3 4 5 i. Women should get equal pay for equal work.
1 2 3 4 5 j. Society should stop overemphasizing how a woman looks.
1 2 3 4 5 k. More day care centers should be provided so that women can participate in activities outside the home if they want to.
1 2 3 4 5 l. Women are an oppressed group who need to fight for their rights.
1 2 3 4 5 m. Abortions should be legalized, with the decision left up to the woman and her doctor.
1 2 3 4 5 n. More women should enter what are now men's jobs, for example, be carpenters and airline pilots.
1 2 3 4 5 o. Men should take home economics in high school.

85. Have you ever heard of the Women's Liberation Movement?

___ Yes ___ No

IF YES:

a. Have you ever participated in any women's movement activities? Check any that apply.

___ Yes, belonged to a small women's discussion group
___ Yes, demonstrated with women's organizations
___ Yes, attended lecture, movie sponsored by a women's group
___ Yes, read books about women's problems or the women's movement

___ No, but I talk about Women's Liberation with friends
___ No, never

b. What is your opinion of the Women's Liberation Movement?

APPENDIX 2

SPECIFICATION OF CODING PROCEDURES AND CODING RELIABILITY DATA

General Procedures

The development of reliable coding schemes is the first stage of data analysis. In this study, all fixed-alternative questions were coded directly from the questionnaires, with random checks for coding and keypunching errors. Initial coding outlines for the open-ended questions were developed on the basis of the responses on a randomly selected group of 29 questionnaires (10 percent of all the completed questionnaires). This response survey provided a fairly complete list of possible responses to the short-answer questions; suggested coding themes for complex questions, such as the "Who Am I?" items; and provided a gauge for determining how many responses would have to be coded for questions where the number of answers was not fixed. Some open-ended questions were coded fairly directly from the questionnaires in order to allow for recategorization along multiple dimensions of interest. Some of these were later recoded into very broad categories, necessitated by the response distributions (e.g., the questions concerning motivations for working). In these cases, the coding reliability data is reported briefly in the text. Responses to other open-ended questions are simply quoted in the text as examples (e.g., the case situations, items 75.-78.). Sex stereotypes for fields of study and occupations were coded based on other data sources, as described below. In the case of three types of measures, occupational status, opinion of the women's movement, and self-concept and conceptions of others, the amount of variation in response was so great that coding categories were developed at the outset. The coding procedures and estimates of reliability for these measures are reported below. All items that used coding schemes that required the application of coder judgment were double-coded by two coders independently.

Sex Stereotypes of Fields of Study and Occupations

Fields of study and occupational aspirations were classified by the sex associated with them. Majors, minors, and graduate school fields were categorized according to the sex stereotype ratings obtained by Feldman (1974, pp. 39-46), which are based on responses to a semantic differential instrument administered to undergraduates at several different types of colleges. All occupational aspirations, the most interesting job held by the subject in the past, and mother's jobs were classified by predominant sex, using 1970 Census data on the proportion of women currently employed in the occupation as the criterion for sex-typing (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1970b, Table 221, pp. 1-718 - 1-724). The categories are defined as follows: feminine = 50 percent or more female, neutral = 37-49.99 percent female (proportion female in the total employed labor force, 37 percent, used as the cutting point), and masculine = 36.99 percent or less female.

These two kinds of measures of sex-typing are not equivalent, as the fields of study estimate is a stereotype measure while the occupational measure is based on actual distributions by sex. However, Feldman (1974, pp. 43-46) shows that the stereotypes are strongly correlated to the actual distribution of men and women working in the field.

Occupational Status

A review of the literature on social class and an analysis of available indexes purporting to measure social status indicate that occupational status is the central element in status rankings. Occupational status commonly is measured by either prestige or socioeconomic rankings. The most widely used prestige rankings, defined as how occupations are valued, are those obtained in the NORC studies begun by North and Hatt (1947) and recently updated by Siegel (1970). Featherman et al. (1974) have made a persuasive argument that the dominant dimension of occupational status is socioeconomic in nature, reflecting the financial rewards and requisite education associated with an occupation. They argue that prestige is a result of socioeconomic attributes, but prestige scores provide erroneous estimates of occupational status.[1]

For this study, I wanted to use a socioeconomic index of occupational status that has been tested for reliability and validity, that has been used fairly extensively by other researchers, and that has documentation readily available concerning the hierarchical placement of specific occupations. These considerations improve coding reliability and allow the reader to compare the status characteristics of this sample to that of other populations. After consideration of several scales that meet these criteria, I chose the Hollingshead Occupational Scale, with status rankings reflecting ". . . the skill and power individuals possess as they perform the many maintenance functions in the society" (Hollingshead, 1965, p. 2).[2]

---

[1] However, because prestige scores are best predicted by education and income (Siegel, 1970, p. 265), there is a strong correlation between prestige and socioeconomic rankings. For example, the correlation between NORC prestige rankings and rankings on Duncan's SE index is approximately .86 (Duncan et al., 1972, p. 48).

---

[2] I gave primary consideration to the occupational status scales used in the Index of Urban Status (Coleman, 1973; Coleman and Neugarten, 1971) and the Duncan SE scale (Duncan, 1961a, 1961b; Duncan et al., 1972) in addition to the Hollingshead Occupational Scale (Hollingshead, 1965; Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958). I chose the latter scale for several reasons. First, this scale has been used by a number of researchers and extensive lists of status placements for detailed occupational titles are available. Second, I did not request family income information from respondents because I felt that a daughter's knowledge of her parents' income probably would be limited and open to error. Income information is required to make occupational status placements using the Coleman scales, and to rank occupations not listed in the Duncan SE scale. Probable income, based on occupational title and educational level, is an implicit criterion in the Hollingshead scale, but detailed income information is not necessary. Third, even if income could be estimated, placement of new occupations using Duncan's detailed scoring system would be more unreliable than placement in broader status categories. Finally, the Hollingshead list includes many more female-dominated occupations than do the other scales. This was an important consideration because such occupations are predominant in the aspirations of the sample. Recently, some researchers have argued that different occupational scales are needed for women and men, because different criteria are used in judging their status. For example, Coleman (1973) argues that the status of the clientele served, rather than the amount of income derived, is the major criterion used to determine women's occupational status. Although not everyone agrees with the relevance of this specific criterion, other researchers have begun to work on new scales that might better describe women's occupational status, though most of the work in this area has concerned occupational prestige rather than socioeconomic rankings (see Haug, 1975; Alice Henry, work in progress, National Institute for Education, 1976). Also, no fully tested alternative categorization system for women was available at the time the data was coded.

All occupational information was coded for social status.[3] Occupations listed by Hollingshead (1965) and additions made and tested by Haug (1973) were coded as indicated on those lists. A total of 122 additional occupations were coded independently by two coders, both of whom had experience in using the Hollingshead scale. The coders agreed on the status placements of 73.8 percent of these occupations. Of the 32 disagreements, almost all were differences of one status level. The disagreements were reconciled by a third coder and by reference to the Alphabetical Index of Occupations and Industries (1970) and other occupational status indexes.[4] The third coder agreed with the first coder on 19 occupations (59.4 percent) and with the second coder on eight occupations (25 percent). Compromise placements were made for five occupations where the first two coders had made status judgments two levels apart.[5]

The majority of the occupations for which status placement disagreement occurred were those jobs held by respondents in the past on a part time, temporary basis (e.g., camp counselor, arts and crafts teacher). Social status probably is not a valid concept in these cases as such jobs are considered preparatory and temporary adolescent endeavors. Those who hold such jobs may be judged more in terms of their potential occupational status than in terms of the actual skill needed to perform the work.[6] Status placements were attempted in this study in order to provide one measure of the type of occupational experience of these women.

---

[3] Items coded for occupational status include: 17., subject's occupational aspiration when in elementary school; 18., subject's occupational aspiration when in high school; 30., subject's current occupational aspiration; 31., subject's current occupational expectation; 34., subject's jobs during the past four years (average status coded); 35., subject's most interesting job; 49., father's occupation; 55., husband's occupation; 56., mother's occupations (average status, highest status, and status of current job coded); and 61., grandfathers' occupations.

[4] Primary sources were Duncan (1961b) and Coleman (1973).

[5] The complete occupational status list, including the original Hollingshead scale and the Haug (1973) and Guttmacher additions, is available from the author.

Opinion of the Women's Liberation Movement

The final item in the questionnaire asks "What is your opinion of the Women's Liberation Movement?" Responses varied from one word to several pages of explanation. The responses were coded along three dimensions: evaluative tone of the comments, coded as basically positive, equivocal or unsure, and basically negative; adequacy of knowledge and understanding of the goals of the women's movement, coded as fairly well-informed, knowledge level unclear, and misinformed or stereotypic response; and thematic content. Coding categories for the last dimension were outlined on the basis of common themes expressed in the initial survey of a ten percent random sample of the questionnaires. Additional themes were added as coding commenced, for a total of 30 themes.[7]

A 25 percent (68) random sample of the questionnaires was coded by two coders. On evaluative tone, there was 77.9 percent agreement, with 15 disagreements, all between one extreme and the equivocal category. On knowledge level, there was 70.6 percent agreement, with 20 disagreements, all between one extreme and the unclear category. On thematic content, with two themes coded per respondent for a total of 136 themes, there was 83.8 percent agreement, with 22 disagreements. All disagreements were reconciled and categories more clearly defined before the coding of the remaining questionnaires. In this report, I use only the evaluative dimension in statistical analysis. The themes are used for illustrative purposes. I have not used the knowledge level dimension because I am not satisfied with the coding reliability and the character of the responses led us to judge the majority of the responses (76 percent of those responding) as unclear concerning level of knowledge.

---

[6] See Duncan (1961b) for a discussion of the age-specific nature of occupational status.

[7] The most common themes are described in the section on sex role attitudes in Chapter V.

Self-Concept and Conceptions of Others

A group of items measuring the subjects' self-concepts, reflected self-appraisals, and views of valued others, were coded with the same categorization scheme to allow for direct comparisons among the responses to these items.[8] None of the published coding schemes used by other researchers to summarize responses to "Who Am I?"-type questions dealt adequately with the theoretical dimensions of interest in this study, or seemed applicable to the types of responses elicited from this sample, as estimated before coding began on the basis of the responses on a ten percent random sample of the questionnaires. Some of the coding categories are based on those used by other researchers, while others were developed by this author.[9] Each response was coded on four dimensions: at a global level, for evaluative tone and sex stereotype; at a middle level of generality, for systematic senses of self; and at a relatively specific level, for content category.

---

[8] Items for which this coding scheme was used include: 41. a., b., c., current, future, and ideal self-concepts; 47.a.,b.,c., subject's perception of how significant others (parents, teacher, boy friend) see her; 45. c., d., subject's desired characteristics for her own children; 65.a., 66.a., subject's perceptions of her parents and bases for identification with parents; and 72.a., 73.a., subject's conceptions of most admired man and woman.

In this report, only the general dimensions of evaluative tone and sex stereotype are used in analysis.[10] Evaluative tone is defined as what is considered by most people as a socially desirable characteristic for an adult member of American society today. Almost all theories about, and measures of, the self-concept consider self-evaluation as a central element of self-definition. Here, self-descriptions were coded as positive, neutral, or negative. In order to provide a common framework for the coders, and to improve coding reliability on this global dimension, I reviewed the literature on self-evaluation, and developed a list of attributes classified by evaluative tone, based on social desirability ratings, and indices of self-evaluation and adjustment used in standardized personality inventories.[11]

---

[9] Examples of coding schemes available, and consulted by the author, include those described by Bugental and Gunning (1955), Bugental and Zelen (1950), C. Gordon (1968), Kemper (1966), Kuhn (1960), Kuhn and McPartland (1954), McLaughlin (1965, 1966), McPartland et al. (1961), Wellman (1969), and Young (1972).

[10] Time constraints and problems with the response distributions on the more specific dimensions did not allow for consideration of all the self-concept dimensions in this report. The systematic senses of self dimension, based on C. Gordon's (1968) conceptualization, defines the needs of the self-concept system as the maintenance of the senses of moral worth, self-determination, unity, and competence. The nine content categories used include physical and ascribed attributes, family statuses, student statuses, occupational statuses, special abilities and interests, affiliation-nurturance, dominance, emotionality, and other psychic states. A coding manual in which all four coding dimensions are defined and examples are provided, and an attribute chart listing 1,077 attributes coded on the four dimensions, are available from the author.

Sex stereotypes are defined as consensual beliefs about the differing characteristics of adult men and women in American society (Rosenkrantz, et al., 1968). This coding dimension does not represent actual differences between men and women, but concerns the general expectations held by members of our society that certain behaviors and attitudes are more characteristic of one sex than the other. The coders used as their frame of reference the situation posed by Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) in their sex stereotype studies: Imagine you are meeting a person for the first time. All you know is that he (she) is an adult male (female). Code the items according to the extent you would expect each response to characterize this person.

No other coding scheme for "Who Am I?" self-concept measures has included a sex stereotype dimension, although almost all standardized personality inventories measure underlying trends of masculinity/femininity. I would argue that sex role conceptions are a central element of the self-concept. As Kagan (1964) notes: ". . .[T]he desire to establish a sex role identification touches many important domains of behavior, including school work, sexual behavior, and vocational choice, and has a strong effect on behavioral continuities over the course of development" (p. 162). Also, since the deviance explanation of the sources of career salience depends in part on the attribution of masculine qualities to highly career-salient women, it was important that I have a measure of the sex-typed nature of self-descriptions.

---

[11] A Supplementary Bibliography on the Self-Concept, which cites the literature reviewed, is available from the author.

All responses were coded as feminine, neutral sex, or masculine. Again, it seemed important to have some external validation for the categorizations made, so I reviewed the available data on sex stereotypes, studies of characteristics that are in general true of men or true of women, and masculinity/femininity scales in standardized personality inventories, and developed a list of attributes classified by sex stereotype.[12] Common elements in the stereotypes are the views that women are more affiliative, nurturant, emotional, and in touch with, and concerned about, feelings than are men. Men are expected to be more dominant, aggressive, self-confident, rational, and analytic than women. Qualities such as intelligence, honesty, and responsibility are not stereotyped as more characteristic of one sex than of the other.

An extensive coding manual was prepared for coder training, in which the coding dimensions were defined and examples were provided.[13] The definitions were clarified after discussion between the two coders and we practiced coding a random sample of 10 questionnaires together.

---

[12] A Supplementary Bibliography on the Self-Concept, which cites the literature reviewed, is available from the author.

[13] The coding manual is available from the author.

The lists of the social desirability and sex-typing of attributes, developed on the basis of the literature review, were combined into a chart crossclassifying 702 human attributes on these two dimensions. A second chart classifies 54 areas of interest and ability by sex stereotype. These charts were used to code matching attributes listed by respondents, and they provided a common framework for the two coders to use in deciding on the coding of new responses on these two dimensions. A random sample of 100 questionnaires was rechecked to insure reliable use of the charts and to insure consistent interpretation of special phrases considered synonymous with key atrributes on the charts. All disagreements were reconciled through discussion between the two coders and necessary changes were made.

Estimates of coding reliability[14] indicate that for evaluative tone, there were 375 new responses (not on the literature review chart), coded with 96.5 percent agreement, with 13 differences, all between one extreme and neutral. For sex stereotype, there were 376 new responses, coded with 91.5 percent agreement, with 32 differences, the majority between one extreme and neutral. Given the possible ambiguity of the concepts summarized, I feel that these estimates represent a high degree of accuracy.[15]

---

[14] The numbers and percentages in the estimates of coding reliability refer to the number of idiosyncratic responses coded, without regard to the number of times respondents used a particular response. Since we pre-coded the charts, and resolved our disagreements at that time, once we had decided on a code, it was used consistently for the same response.

[15] The attribute chart is available from the author.

Because the questionnaire included a closed-ended personality measure (item 74.), as well as the open-ended "Who Am I?" question, it is possible to further assess the reliability of the coding methods and the validity of the assertion that the dimensions coded represent important underlying dimensions of personality functioning. On the closed-ended questions, there were no consistent patterns of response that could be summarized as composite indexes that could meet all the reliability tests required.[18] The most reliable composites do indicate a tendency to evaluate oneself in positive or negative terms, and a tendency for negative "feminine" attributes and concerns to cluster together.[19]

---

[18] See Appendix 3 for a discussion of the reliability tests performed.

[19] The item-to-item correlations and factor analyses suggest the following patterns: 1) A positive, self-confidence dimension, consisting of the degree to which a woman agrees that she is a leader, pretty, popular with boys, has many friends, is able to express her ideas, and is willing to speak up in class (KR_{20} = .6671); and 2) a negative, stereotypically feminine dimension, consisting of the degree to which a woman agrees that she is depressed, needs to have people around to be happy, can't control what happens, is too emotional, worries a lot about the future, is afraid people won't like her, and doesn't say anything when insulted by others (KR_{20} = .6848).

It is clear that the evaluative tone and sex stereotype dimensions are not independent, but this is a reflection of societal attitudes that assign more desirability to masculine than to feminine characteristics (Brown, 1958; Lynn, 1959; McKee and Sheriffs, 1957; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968). The positive correlations between viewing oneself as pretty and popular and having masculine dominance attributes suggest that overall self-confidence may be a more important differentiating dimension of the self-concept than is the possession of "masculine" attributes, a contention that is supported by Rand's (1968) findings.

Table 34 compares the mean scores on the evaluative tone and sex stereotype dimensions of the self-concept, as measured by the "I am . . ." cue, to responses to the personality inventory items. One can not expect those whose overall self-description tends to show a trend of self-evaluation or sex-typing to respond in a correspondent manner for every specific trait listed in the inventory. However, it is clear that, in general, these women ratings of themselves on specific attributes are consistent with the more global dimensions summarized in the "Who Am I?" coding categories.

Overall, these data indicate a pattern of response consistency between the two very different types of personality measures, which suggests that both measures are quite reliable. The importance of the dimensions used in categorizing the "Who Am I? measures of the self-concept, and the reliability of the coding methods, receive some support, although ideally the inventory items also should have been factorable along the same dimensions.

Table 34.--Relationships between Scores on the Evaluative Tone and Sex Stereotype Dimensions of the Current Self-Concept and Responses to the Personality Inventory Items

	Evaluative Tone			Sex Stereotype	
	n	r	p	r	p
Positive feminine attributes					
Am pretty	241	.1107	<.043	-.0622	NS
Am popular with boys	242	.0650	NS	-.0619	NS
Positive neutral sex attributes					
Am good at school work[a]	243	.0649	NS	-.0525	NS
Have many friends[a]	244	.1091	<.044	-.1301	<.021
Positive masculine attributes					
Am a leader in most groups	245	.1152	<.036	-.1345	<.018
Want to get ahead in life[a]	245	.0330	NS	-.1406	<.014
Like to compete	245	.0481	NS	-.1582	<.007
Take things as they come	244	.0666	NS	-.1175	<.033
Express my ideas strongly	244	.1406	<.014	-.1301	<.021
Neutral feminine attributes					
Need people around	244	-.0048	NS	.0700	NS
Negative feminine attributes					
Am often depressed	245	-.2184	<.001	.1394	<.015
Don't speak up in class	245	-.1813	<.002	.0930	NS
Can't control what happens	244	-.1676	<.004	.1014	NS
Am too emotional	244	-.1843	<.002	.1909	<.001
Worry about appearance[a]	244	-.0249	NS	.0718	NS
Am afraid people won't like me	244	-.1131	<.039	.1062	<.049

Table 34.--Continued

	Evaluative Tone			Sex Stereotype	
	n	r	p	r	p
Negative feminine attributes					
Don't say anything when insulted	243	-.1342	<.018	.1388	<.015
Worry about the future	245	-.0650	NS	.1436	<.012

NOTE: Evaluative tone and sex stereotype scores are the mean score across all responses, with up to five responses coded per subject. Evaluative tone is coded 1 = positive and 2 = neutral/negative. Sex stereotype is coded 1 = feminine and 2 = neutral sex/masculine. The personality inventory items have codes ranging from 1 = very true to 5 = not at all true. Here, these categories are crossclassified by evaluative tone and sex stereotype, based on how they would have been coded, using the chart of social desirability and sex stereotype ratings, had a respondent mentioned this characteristic as true of her in the open-ended question.

[a] Because most of the respondents view these characteristics as at least "somewhat true" of them, these items were dichotomized into categories of 1 = very true and 2 = all other responses.

APPENDIX 3

PROCEDURES USED IN INDEX CONSTRUCTION AND ESTIMATES OF INDEX RELIABILITY

General Procedures

A number of the variables used in analysis are operationally defined as composite indexes based on several questionnaire items that together best summarize the theoretical construct of interest. An attempt was made to measure constructs with several items wherever space limitations permitted in order to provide a gauge of response consistency and in order to avoid the reliability and validity problems inherent in basing conclusions on responses to only one question. Several general procedures were followed in all cases where a composite index was formed.

First, although most of the data collected here are ordinal data, statistical procedures that assume interval-level measures were used. There is disagreement among methodologists as to the propriety of such use, though statistical procedures designed for interval data are routinely used with ordinal measures.[1]

I chose to use parametric statistical tests for several reasons. First, I felt that it was important to retain the degree distinctions provided by Likert-style items, so I did not want to have to dichotomize these measures. I expected to see linear relationships among related items, but I did not necessarily expect one-to-one correspondence in degree of agreement. For these reasons, crosstabular analysis to determine item-to-item correlations did not seem appropriate. Also, since a number of ties could be expected, rank-order correlation procedures were not ideal. Therefore, in order to retain the four or five level distinctions and to measure linear correlation, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients seemed most appropriate.

---

[1] See Abelson and Tukey (1970) and Labovitz (1970, 1972) for more extensive discussion of the justification of the use of interval statistics with ordinal data.

Second, I chose to define index scores as the mean of the scores on the nonmissing items in order to develop scores for as many respondents as possible. Most of the composite indexes are made up of fixed-alternative items where there is little missing data. Respondents were given a score on the composite index if they answered the majority of the items. If the items in an index have the same metric, the index score is the mean of the nonmissing item scores. If the items in a composite index use different metrics, the mean of the nonmissing standardized scores defines the index score. Once mean composite scores are computed, the originally discrete data becomes relatively continuous, making use of parametric statistics less problematic.

Finally, most parametric statistics assume a normal distribution. While this assumption refers to the distribution of a characteristic in the population and not in a sample, I chose to avoid items that had highly skewed distributions for the sample. Since a skewed distribution usually indicates lack of differentiation among respondents, such items are not very useful in any case.

Several general standards were used to determine if a composite index or scale is reliable. All item-to-item correlations must be highly significant ($\underline{p} < .001$) and strong ($\underline{r} > .2$). All items in the scale must be more strongly related to each other than to other items that measure the same type of construct or use the same measurement device. The item-to-scale correlations must be highly significant ($\underline{p} < .0001$) and strong ($\underline{r} > .5$). For each composite index, a measure of scale reliability, the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 (KR_{20}), is reported. This measure summarizes the response consistency of the items in the index as a single reliability coefficient. A reliable scale should have a reliability coefficient of .7 or better. Indexes should factor out of a series of items measuring the same type of construct when entered into a principal components factor procedure. All related items were factored with orthogonal or oblique rotation, depending on whether I expected the different dimensions to be correlated. For attitude data, at least 40 percent of the variance should be explained by a small number of factors (see Armor and Couch, 1971, p. 122). Items should have at least a .5 loading on the factor representing the index to which they belong. Finally, response consistency was tested wherever possible by comparing responses to items and/or indexes that measure the same or related constructs.

The great majority of the indexes used here meet all of these criteria. In a few cases, where the various estimates of reliability did not agree, judgments of whether the index should be retained for analysis were made, based primarily on whether other measures of the variables were available and on whether use of the index would mask important differentiating relationships of the individual item components with career salience. The following tables, summarizing the correlation, factor, and scale reliability tests for each index developed, are presented in the order in which the indexes are discussed in the text.[2]

---

[2] In all the tables that follow, item-to-item and item-to-scale correlations are significant at at least the $<.001$ level unless otherwise noted. For the factor analyses, in cases where the items all loaded on one factor, the factor table is the initial factor matrix, without rotation. Where oblique rotation of multiple factors was used, the factor structure matrix is reported. The loading represents the correlation between the variable and the factor. The square of this correlation equals the amount of variance in the variable explained by the factor, including direct and indirect (because of the correlations among the factors) contributions. The highest factor loadings, indicating which items best define the content of the factor, are underlined. Tables reporting the correlations among factors, based on the factor pattern matrix of direct contributions, also are included.

Academic Achievement Index

Table 35.--Academic Achievement Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	High School Rank	Verbal SAT	Overall GPA
Verbal SAT	.3067		
Overall GPA	.3936	.3730	
Academic achievement index[a]	.7479	.7325	.7904

[a] Components of the index are weighted according to the factor score coefficients.

Table 36.--Academic Achievement Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings

	Academic Achievement Index
Overall GPA	.79041
High school rank	.74682
Verbal SAT	.73091

NOTE: One factor explains 57.2 percent of the variance.

KR_{20} = .6206 (estimated, without weights).

Educational and Occupational Values Indexes

Educational Values

Table 37.--Self-Development Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Become Well-rounded	Gain Self-Knowledge	Be Exposed to New Ideas	Learn Social Skills
Gain self-knowledge	.4206			
Be exposed to new ideas	.4186	.4954		
Learn social skills	.3101	.5753	.4852	
Self-development orientation	.6788	.8316	.7372	.8098

Table 38.--Family-Betterment Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Be a Better Wife	Be a Better Mother
Be a better mother	.6708	
Family-betterment orientation	.9097	.9205

Table 39.--Educational Values: Factor Structure

	Self-Development Orientation	Family-Betterment Orientation	Extrinsic-Rewards Orientation[a]
Become well-rounded	.64099	.38670	.09421
Gain self-knowledge	.81591	.21511	-.07413
Be a better wife	.23198	.89375	.20237
Get a good job	-.17058	.34998	.79241
Be a better mother	.22914	.90592	.20328
Gain prestige	.03719	.08909	.88054
Be exposed to new ideas	.80266	.06904	-.04672
Learn social skills	.79638	.15234	-.07885
KR_{20} =	.7551	.8184	.5674

NOTE: Principal components factor structure after oblique rotation, delta = .00. Three factors explain 69.4 percent of the variance.

[a] Because of the low scale reliability coefficient and the skewed distribution on the "good job" variable, the extrinsic-rewards orientation index is not used in analysis. Therefore, the relevant correlations, though strong, are not reported here.

Table 40.--Educational Values: Factor Correlations

	Self-Development Orientation	Family-Betterment Orientation
Family-betterment orientation	.2168	
Extrinsic-rewards orientation	-.0514	.2280

Occupational Values

Table 41.--Extrinsic-Rewards Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Advancement	Money	Prestige
Money	.4983		
Prestige	.4154	.6070	
Extrinsic-rewards orientation	.7587	.7938	.8323

Table 42.--Family Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Hours	Easy to Return
Easy to return	.5060	
Family orientation	.8495	.8882

Table 43.--Occupational Values: Factor Structure

	Extrinsic-Rewards Orientation	Family Orientation
Advancement	.75670	.28164
Money	.84927	.44854
Hours	.22554	.82759
Prestige	.84665	.26653
Easy to return	.35010	.80558
Not take job home[a]	.34746	.68273
KR_{20} =	.7553	.6810

NOTE: Principal components factor structure after oblique rotation, delta = .00. Two factors explain 64.2 percent of the variance. Factor correlation = .3849.

Table 43.--Continued

[a] This item was dropped from the final family orientation index because its inclusion reduced scale reliability.

General Value-Orientations

Table 44.--General Extrinsic-Rewards Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Good Job	Prestige (Ed.)	Advancement	Money	Prestige (Occ.)
Prestige (education)	.4078				
Advancement	.3718	.2601			
Money	.4761	.4212	.4983		
Prestige (occupation)	.4120	.6373	.4154	.6070	
Extrinsic-rewards orientation	.6920	.7608	.6560	.7938	.8323

Table 45.--General Family Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Better Wife	Better Mother	Hours	Easy to Return
Better mother	.6708			
Hours	.3137	.3288		
Easy to return	.3491	.4512	.5060	
Family orientation	.7706	.8175	.6889	.7672

Table 46.--General Value-Orientations: Factor Structure

	Extrinsic-Rewards Orientation	Family Orientation
Better wife	.12552	.80789
Good job	.65746	.39684
Better mother	.14906	.84449
Prestige (ed.)	.72996	.16431
Advancement	.65146	.16394
Money	.82051	.30270
Hours	.33868	.64169
Prestige (occ.)	.84583	.18860
Easy to return	.38278	.71495
KR_{20} =	.8015	.7743

NOTE: Principal components factor structure after oblique rotation, *delta* = .00. Two factors explain 57.8 percent of the variance. Factor correlation = .2976.

Reasons for Choosing this College

Table 47.--College Choice Quality Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Quality of School	Offered Desired Program
Offered desired program	.5180	
College choice quality index	.8689	.8732

Table 48.--College Choice Parochialism Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Commuting Distance	Wanted to Stay Near Home	Friends Going Here
Wanted to stay near home	.4376		
Friends going here	.3501	.2365	
College choice parochialism index	.8047	.7696	.6688

Table 49.--Reasons for Choosing This College: Factor Structure

	College Choice Parochialism Index	College Choice Quality Index
Quality of school	-.00935	.85752
Commuting distance	.81143	-.18870
Wanted to stay near home	.75652	.15518
Friends going here	.67961	.01160
Offered desired program	.01002	.87255
KR_{20} =	.6175	.7739

NOTE: Principal components factor structure after oblique rotation, *delta* = .00. Two factors explain 65 percent of the variance. Factor correlation = -.0012.

Sex Role Ideology Indexes

Table 50.--Marital Role Ideology Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	(b)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)[a]	(j)	(k)	(l)
(b) Raising children is mother's job										
(d) Wife should earn less than husband	.3507									
(e) Mother should prepare daughter to be wife	.3760	.3393								
(f) Marriage should have segregated roles	.4474	.3486	.6347							
(g) Mother should stay home when children small	.3056	.2440	.3493	.5124						
(h) Woman's major satisfaction is family	.4741	.4335	.5503	.6280	.5398					
(i) Wife has duty to earn living for family[a]	-.1855	-.2361	-.2367	-.3655	-.3017	-.3551				
(j) Husband should have main say-so in family	.3799	.3242	.5096	.5525	.3494	.5396	-.2028			
(k) Wife helps husband by caring for house	.2756	.3298	.3826	.5230	.4530	.5423	-.3686	.4451		
(l) Husband should not help with housekeeping	.2885	.2596	.3445	.4533	.2842	.3948	-.2313	.3796	.3905	
Marital role ideology index	.6158	.5631	.7190	.8278	.6454	.8190	.5015	.7093	.6919	.5995

Table 50.--Continued

NOTE: Letters refer to the item identification in the questionnaire (item 79.).

[a] Scores on item (i) were reversed before inclusion in the index score because of the consistent negative item-to-item correlations.

Table 51.--Marital Role Ideology Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings

		Marital Role Ideology Index
(b)	Raising children is mother's job	.59831
(d)	Wife should earn less than husband	.55299
(e)	Mother should prepare daughter to be wife	.71478
(f)	Marriage should have segregated roles	.83318
(g)	Mother should stay at home when children small	.64361
(h)	Woman's major satisfaction is family	.82851
(i)	Wife has duty to earn living for family[a]	-.47766
(j)	Husband should have main say-so in family	.72069
(k)	Wife helps husband by caring for house	.70409
(l)	Husband should not help with housekeeping	.59469

NOTE: One factor explains 45.7 percent of the variance. KR_{20} = .8674.

[a] Scores on item (i) were reversed in computing the final index score because of the negative factor loading.

Table 52.--Feminist Attitudes Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(n)	(o)
(a) Men should enter women's jobs											
(b) Women should be drafted	.3913										
(c) More women should be leaders	.4143	.3410									
(f) Marriage should be abolished	.2614	.2803	.2865								
(g) Women need to form groups	.2993	.2357	.3056	.3281							
(h) Men should care for children	.5242	.4471	.4153	.4135	.2751						
(j) Stop emphasizing women's looks	.3186	.2743	.3706	.2753	.2368	.3262					
(k) Need more day care centers	.2879	.2120	.3452	.2876	.3230	.2884	.3181				
(l) Women are an oppressed group	.4319	.3704	.4994	.3550	.5971	.4217	.4967	.4551			
(n) Women should enter men's jobs	.7289	.3957	.4816	.3577	.3808	.6079	.3885	.3946	.5230		
(o) Men should take home economics	.4083	.2579	.3519	.2270	.3051	.3742	.1232[a]	.2418	.3015	.5296	
Feminist attitudes index	.7128	.6061	.6551	.5646	.6024	.7115	.5734	.5679	.7649	.8117	.5824

Table 52.--Continued

NOTE: Letters refer to the item identification in the questionnaire (item 84.).

$^a p < .024$

Table 53.--Feminist Attitudes Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings

		Feminist Attitudes Index
(a)	Men should enter women's jobs	.72965
(b)	Women should be drafted	.57600
(c)	More women should be leaders	.67329
(f)	Marriage should be abolished	.53650
(g)	Women need to form groups	.58705
(h)	Men should care for children	.72895
(j)	Stop emphasizing women's looks	.56528
(k)	Need more day care centers	.57166
(l)	Women are an oppressed group	.76908
(n)	Women should enter men's jobs	.82732
(o)	Men should take home economics	.56777

NOTE: One factor explains 43.0 percent of the variance. $KR_{20} = .8632$.

Changes in College Index

Table 54.--Change in Intellectual Aspirations Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Want More Education	More Committed to Career	Enjoy Learning More
More committed to career	.4341		
Enjoy learning more	.4421	.4097	
Change in intellectual aspirations index	.8213	.7716	.7705

NOTE: $KR_{20} = .7626$

Table 55.--Changes in College: Factor Structure

	Intellectual Aspirations	Disappointment, Confusion	Relationship with Parents
Changed career plans	-.08669	.50128	-.07733
Cynical about value of education	.02239	.70019	.24239
Alienated from parents	.08654	.55569	-.57242
Want to continue education	.70272	-.05502	.03990
Understand parents	.25996	.05006	.76990
Committed to career	.66082	.01301	.06093
Enjoy learning for own sake	.65259	-.03626	.21543
More concerned about marriage than career	-.58731	.16338	.34662

NOTE: Principal components factor structure after oblique rotation, delta = .00. Three factors explain 48.8 percent of the variance. Because the content of the second and third factors is not definitive, only the first dimension is used in analysis.

Table 56.--Changes in College: Factor Correlations

	Intellectual Aspirations	Disappointment, Confusion
Disappointment, confusion	-.0910	
Relationship with parents	-.0412	-.0278

Socioeconomic Status Index

Table 57.--Family Socioeconomic Status Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	High Occupational Status[a]	Father's Education	Mother's Education
Father's education	.6008		
Mother's education	.4052	.4408	
Family socioeconomic status index[b]	.8555	.8821	.6901

[a] Father's occupational status or status of mother's current occupation, depending on which is higher.

[b] Components of the index are weighted according to the factor score coefficients.

Table 58.--Family Socioeconomic Status Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings

	Family Socioeconomic Status
High occupational status	.83621
Father's education	.85294
Mother's education	.73698

NOTE: One factor explains 65.7 percent of the variance. KR_{20} = .7340 (estimated, without weights).

Mother's Work History Index

Table 59.--Mother's Work History Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

Mother Worked While Subject Was in:	Pre-school	Elementary School	High School	College
Elementary school	.5572			
High school	.3956	.5134		
College	.3554	.4387	.6839	
Mother's work history index	.6107	.7376	.7770	.7274

NOTE: KR_{20} = .6902.

Parental Roles Indexes

Table 60.--Maternal Dominance Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Makes Decisions	Handles Money
Handles money	.5513	
Maternal dominance index	.8779	.8912

Table 61.--Maternal Roles: Factor Structure

	Warmth[a]	Protectiveness[b]	Dominance
(d) Sets restrictions	-.23356	.66344	-.33688
(e) Makes decisions	.04798	.18736	-.89524
(i) Understands me	.77119	.03712	-.16982
(j) Handles money	.08886	.37174	-.83905
(k) Disagrees with me	-.82246	.09547	-.02918
(o) Dissatisfied with me	-.75406	.18751	-.03186
(p) Listens to me	.69030	.17274	-.07139
(q) Worries about me	-.03346	.72067	-.27791
(t) Is protective	.11263	.77795	-.14499
KR_{20} =	.7640	.5540	.7468

NOTE: Letters refer to the item identification in the questionnaire (item 67.). Principal components factor structure after oblique rotation, delta = .00. Three factors explain 62.3 percent of the variance.

[a] The maternal warmth index is not used in the analysis. The component items are incorporated into the maternal closeness index described in Tables 66 and 67.

[b] The maternal protectiveness index is not used in analysis because of the poor scale reliability score. Therefore, the relevant correlations, though adequate, are not reported here.

Table 62.--Maternal Roles: Factor Correlations

	Warmth	Protectiveness
Protectiveness	-.0303	
Dominance	-.0339	-.3044

Table 63.--Paternal Dominance Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Makes Decisions	Handles Money
Handles money	.4279	
Paternal dominance index	.8064	.8909

Table 64.--Paternal Roles: Factor Structure

	Warmth[a]	Protectiveness[b]	Dominance
(d) Sets restrictions	-.28196	.65430	-.29817
(e) Makes decisions	.10769	.22700	-.84384
(i) Understands me	.75192	.07315	-.20120
(j) Handles money	.14816	-.02635	-.83588
(k) Disagrees with me	-.73754	.22663	.02312
(o) Dissatisfied with me	-.77383	.01563	-.04259
(p) Listens to me	.76361	.07971	-.22352
(q) Worries about me	.10875	.76520	-.16686
(t) Is protective	-.01173	.77139	.07956
KR_{20} =	.7050	.6268	.6247

NOTE: Letters refer to the item identification in the questionnaire (item 67.). Principal components factor structure after oblique rotation, *delta* = .00. Three factors explain 62.6 percent of the variance.

[a] The paternal warmth index is not used in the analysis. The component items are incorporated into the paternal closeness index described in Tables 68 and 69.

[b] The paternal protectiveness index is not used in the analysis because the scale reliability coefficient is not ideal and because the maternal protectiveness index also was weak. The relevant correlations, though strong, are not reported here.

Table 65.--Paternal Roles: Factor Correlations

	Warmth	Protectiveness
Protectiveness	-.0473	
Dominance	-.0925	-.1403

Table 66.--Closeness to Mother Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
(1) Understands me						
(2) Doesn't disagree with me	.4747					
(3) Not dissatisfied with me	.4316	.5769				
(4) Listens to me	.4703	.3463	.3881			
(5) Go to mother for advice	.4706	.2570	.2845	.3657		
(6) Want to be like mother	.4114	.4112	.4101	.2156	.2837	
Closeness to mother index	.7742	.7287	.7390	.6680	.6386	.6576

Table 67.--Closeness to Mother Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings

	Closeness to Mother Index
Understands me	.80384
Doesn't disagree with me	.71969
Not dissatisfied with me	.69910
Listens to me	.63125
Go to mother for advice	.65358
Want to be like mother	.60794

NOTE: One factor explains 46.6 percent of the variance.

$KR_{20} = .7968$.

Table 68.--Closeness to Father Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
(1) Understands me						
(2) Doesn't disagree with me	.3601					
(3) Not dissatisfied with me	.3882	.4090				
(4) Listens to me	.5055	.3642	.3938			
(5) Go to father for advice	.4487	.3011	.2584	.3606		
(6) Want to be like father	.3965	.2217	.2138	.2668	.2702	
Closeness to father index	.7691	.6577	.6601	.7245	.6510	.5922

Table 69.--Closeness to Father Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings

	Closeness to Father Index
Understands me	.78721
Doesn't disagree with me	.70432
Not dissatisfied with me	.69982
Listens to me	.72595
Go to father for advice	.65698
Want to be like father	.52870

NOTE: One factor explains 47.4 percent of the variance.

$KR_{20} = .7634$

Table 70.--Father's Advice Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	(a)	(b)	(e)	(f)	(i)	(j)
(a) Get education for better life						
(b) Save money for rainy day	.2186					
(e) Prepare to care for self	.2151	.2951				
(f) Teaching is good woman's job	.3098	.2276	.1544[a]			
(i) Get education just in case	.3308	.3176	.3063	.3422		
(j) Find man to provide for you	.3070	.2266	.1550[a]	.2740	.3881	
Father's advice index	.6304	.6102	.5670	.6141	.7151	.6231

NOTE: Letters refer to the item identification in the questionnaire (item 69.).

[a] $p < .005$.

Table 71.--Father's Advice Index: Principal Components Factor Loadings

	Father's Advice Index
(a) Get education for better life	.63729
(b) Save money for rainy day	.59422
(e) Prepare to care for self	.53372
(f) Teaching is good woman's job	.61382
(i) Get education just in case	.74221
(j) Find man to provide for you	.63325

NOTE: One factor explains 39.5 percent of the variance.
$KR_{20} = .6906$.

Table 72.--Father's Involvement in Housekeeping: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Garbage	Dishes	Cooking	Shopping	Cleaning
Dishes	.3355				
Cooking	.0825[a]	.2549			
Shopping	.2734	.1101[b]	.3369		
Cleaning	.1758[c]	.5095	.2797	.1628[d]	
Father's involvement in housekeeping	.6429	.6597	.6053	.6462	.6017

NOTE: $KR_{20} = .6092$.

[a] $p < .099$ (NS).

[b] $p < .04$.

[c] $p < .003$.

[d] $p < .005$.

Parents' Educational Values Indexes

Table 73.--Mother's Self-Development Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Become Well-rounded	Gain Self-Knowledge	Be Exposed to New Ideas	Learn Social Skills
Gain self-knowledge	.5616			
Be exposed to new ideas	.4926	.6513		
Learn social skills	.4649	.6718	.6830	
Mother's self-development orientation	.7406	.8711	.8554	.8561

Table 74.--Mother's Family-Betterment Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Be a Better Wife	Be a Better Mother
Be a better mother	.6261	
Mother's family-betterment orientation	.8989	.9058

Table 75.--Mother's Educational Values: Factor Structure

	Self-Development Orientation	Security Orientation[a]	Family-Betterment Orientation
Become well-rounded	.77110	.08459	-.08752
Gain self-knowledge	.67058	-.24355	-.47758
Be a better wife	.13625	.24511	-.81045
Please parents	.07544	.72389	-.17583
Be a better mother	.16588	.15066	-.85240
Gain prestige	-.03361	.81629	-.08821
Learn a skill	-.09523	.70152	-.14318
Be exposed to new ideas	.79324	-.05422	-.06475
Learn social skills	.63761	-.08792	-.42347
KR_{20} =	.8521	.6636	.7690

NOTE: Principal components factor structure after oblique rotation, delta = .00. Three factors explain 61.2 percent of the variance.

[a] The security orientation factor is not used in analysis because the reliability coefficient is somewhat low and because the component items do not meet the test of being related to other variables in a consistent fashion.

Table 76.--Mother's Educational Values: Factor Correlations

	Self-Development Orientation	Security Orientation
Security orientation	-.0663	
Family-betterment orientation	-.2333	-.1149

Table 77.--Father's Self-Development Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Become Well-rounded	Gain Self-Knowledge	Be Exposed to New Ideas	Learn Social Skills
Gain self-knowledge	.7233			
Be exposed to new ideas	.6733	.6266		
Learn social skills	.5822	.6722	.6641	
Father's self-development orientation	.8561	.8761	.8637	.8517

Table 78.--Father's Family-Betterment Orientation: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

	Be a Better Wife	Be a Better Mother
Be a better mother	.6763	
Father's family-betterment orientation	.9074	.9249

Table 79.--Father's Educational Values: Factor Structure

	Self-Development Orientation	Security Orientation[a]	Family-Betterment Orientation
Become well-rounded	.75590	.24340	-.34553
Gain self-knowledge	.78327	.08745	-.38343
Be a better wife	.36269	.30432	-.86710
Please parents	.06196	.70432	-.43240
Be a better mother	.35487	.17675	-.90784
Gain prestige	.02874	.85434	-.10889
Learn a skill	.19493	.77903	-.24171
Be exposed to new ideas	.76164	.05335	-.14511
Learn social skills	.74935	.00844	-.30427
KR_{20} =	.8828	.6514	.8183

NOTE: Principal components factor structure after oblique rotation, delta = .00. Three factors explain 65.9 percent of the variance.

[a] The security orientation factor is not used in analysis because the reliability coefficient is somewhat low and because the component items do not meet the test of being related to other variables in a consistent fashion.

Table 80.--Father's Educational Values: Factor Correlations

	Self-Development Orientation	Security Orientation
Security orientation	.1036	
Family-betterment orientation	-.3424	-.2613

Homogeneity of Social Experience Indexes

Table 81.--Religious Homogeneity Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

Religion of Peers in:	Elementary School	High School	Neighborhood
High school	.6068		
Neighborhood	.3783	.3163	
Religious homogeneity index	.8381	.8184	.7131

Table 82.--Ethnic Homogeneity Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

Ethnicity of Peers in:	Elementary School	High School	Neighborhood
High school	.7551		
Neighborhood	.5101	.4861	
Ethnic homogeneity index	.8869	.8778	.7745

Table 83.--Financial Homogeneity Index: Item-to-Item and Item-to-Scale Correlations

Family Income of Peers in:	Elementary School	High School	Neighborhood
High school	.5384		
Neighborhood	.4159	.3805	
Financial homogeneity index	.8249	.8222	.7378

Table 84.--Homogeneity of Social Experience Indexes: Factor Structure

	Ethnic Homogeneity	Religious Homogeneity	Financial Homogeneity
Elementary school			
Religion	.39347	.82107	.24347
Ethnicity	.88659	.35937	.33289
Family income	.36649	.21619	.81731
High school			
Religion	.62298	.67183	.32618
Ethnicity	.92108	.19462	.31688
Family income	.61009	.14489	.71910
Neighborhood			
Religion	.14870	.80434	.08541
Ethnicity	.61944	.36812	.31826
Family income	.18938	.12287	.80942
KR_{20} =	.8024	.7030	.7163

NOTE: Principal components factor structure after oblique rotation, *delta* = .00. Three factors explain 67.4 percent of the variance. Although each of the homogeneity indexes has a reasonable scale reliability coefficient, the factor structure is not well-defined, with quite strong correlations among factors (see Table 85). Therefore, a general social homogeneity index also was developed, including all the above measures. The item-to-item correlations indicate some weak relationships between income and religion measures, particularly for neighborhood homogeneity. The scale reliability coefficient for the index of social homogeneity is .8137.

Table 85.--Homogeneity of Social Experience Indexes: Factor Correlations

	Ethnic Homogeneity	Religious Homogeneity
Religious homogeneity	.3283	
Financial homogeneity	.3834	.1890

APPENDIX 4

ESTIMATES OF THE RELIABILITY OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Respondents reported four measures of academic achievement: rank in high school class, Scholastic Aptitude Test scores, college grade point average, and grade point average in the academic major. It was not possible to check subjects' reports against administrative records because this would have broken the rules of confidentiality under which the data was collected and because the administration was reluctant to allow me access to the necessary information.

There is some indication that students may have inflated their past performance somewhat. Table 86 compares the achievement distributions for the sample to estimates for the entire college population. There are several possible explanations for the differences. The sample may not be representative of the population on the ability dimension. It may be that if data for all women in the population were available, the distributions would be closer matches.[1] Other differential attributes of the sample, such as the higher proportion of education students, might account for the difference, although, as reported in Chapter III, there are no significant differences in past academic performance between education students and other students. Low-achievers might be over-represented among nonrespondents because they might have found completing the questionnaire more burdensome than did high achievers. However, as noted in Chapter III, to the extent the random sample of nonrespondents can be considered representative, this explanation does not hold, as there are no significant differences in past achievement between the random sample and other respondents. Finally, the sample may not be the source of the difference, but the data itself may be unreliable.

---

[1] Institutional achievement data was not available by sex, but it is my impression as a teacher, corroborated by informal comments of the admissions staff, that men with lower pre-college achievement had been enrolled in order to improve the sex ratio.

It is not possible to pinpoint the exact reasons for these differences, but I believe I can suggest the most logical explanations. My guess is that respondents did inflate their reports of high school rank and SAT scores somewhat. I believe that this was the result of the use of categories rather than asking respondents to report specific scores. For example, I believe that women who scored at the college median, the very high 400's on their SAT's, categorized themselves as having scored in the 500's. Their categorization is accurate in that they were closer to 500 than to 400, so I feel that a poor choice of categories, rather than major unreliability in reporting, is the problem.

In the case of college grade point averages, no directly comparable data for the entire college population is available. In order to graduate, students must have an overall grade point average of 2.00 (to be reached and maintained by the end of the junior year) and an academic major average of 2.20. Education students are required to have a minimum overall grade point average of 2.00, and averages of 2.50 in their academic major and in the education sequence, with grades of C or better

Table 86.--Comparison of the Sample to the Population on Selected Achievement Measures

	Population (N = 1,846)	Sample (n = 271)
	Average Percentage[a]	Percentage
High school rank		
Top 10 percent	27.0	37.3
Top 25 percent	22.0	40.6
Top 50 percent	33.0	19.9
Bottom 50 percent	18.0	.7
Don't know	-	1.5
Verbal SAT score		
700's	.5	2.6
600's	8.5	17.3
500's	33.8	42.4
400's	54.5	31.4
300's	2.7	5.2
No response	-	1.1
Math SAT score		
700's	1.7	.4
600's	9.5	12.9
500's	36.8	44.6
400's	47.5	37.6
300's	4.5	3.0
No response	-	1.5

Table 86.--Continued

	Sample Only (n = 271)	
	Overall GPA Percentage	Major GPA Percentage
College grade point average		
3.5 or above	6.6	17.0
3.0 to 3.4	29.9	32.1
2.5 to 2.9	38.7	31.0
2.0 to 2.4	18.8	10.0
1.9 and below	4.1	1.8
Don't know[b]	.4	3.0
No response[b]	1.5	5.2

[a] The population estimates are based on data for the entering classes of 1968 - 1971 included in the Institutional Self-Evaluation, 1971, pp. 254, 256, 257. Absolute frequencies are not reported in this report. The data reproduced here are the average proportions for the four classes. The average median verbal SAT score for these classes was 487.5, while the average mathematics median score was 495.7.

[b] Those respondents who answered "don't know" or did not respond are primarily freshmen, who were in their second college semester and may not have completed any courses in their major.

in all education courses. At the time the study was conducted, the administration was beginning to show concern with grade inflation. In the previous two years, 58 percent of all course grades awarded were honor grades (B or better), and 62 percent of grades awarded in education courses were honor grades (Institutional Self-Evaluation, 1971). Based on these data, I expect that the grade point averages reported by students are quite accurate.[2]

More important than the reliability of a particular score report is the consistency of reported scores on several achievement measures. Tables 35 and 36 in Appendix 3 indicate that the various self-reported achievement measures are highly correlated and load on one academic achievement factor, with the math SAT score showing the weakest association. Although there is some cause for concern with the reliability of specific score reports, the general pattern of academic achievement is consistent. An academic achievement index, composed of the verbal SAT score, high school rank, and overall college grade point average, weighted according to the factor score coefficients, is used in the analysis.

---

[2] The overrepresentation of education students in the sample does not seem to account for the relatively high overall or major grade point averages. As reported in Chapter III, there are no significant differences between education students and other students on these measures. Also, the random sample of nonrespondents reports significantly higher academic major grade point averages than do the other respondents, leading one to discount the possibility that low achievers are overrepresented among the nonrespondents.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abelson, R. P., & Tukey, J. W. Efficient conversion of non-metric information into metric information. In E. R. Tufte (Ed.), The quantitative analysis of social problems. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

Aberle, D. F., & Naegale, K. D. Middle class fathers occupational role and attitudes toward children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1952, 22, 366-378.

Abramovitz, S.I., Weitz, L.J., Schwartz, J. M., Amira, S., Gomes, B., & Abramowitz, C. V. Comparative counselor inferences toward women with medical school aspirations. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1975, 16, 128-130.

Alexander, K. L., & Eckland, B. K. Sex differences in the educational attainment process. American Sociological Review, 1974, 39, 668-682.

Allgeier, E. R. Beyond sowing and growing: Relationship of sex typing to socialization, family plans, and future orientation. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1975, 5, 217-226.

Almquist, E. M. Sex stereotypes in occupational choice: The case for college women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 5, 13-21.

Almquist, E. M., & Angrist, S. S. Career salience and atypicality of occupational choice among college women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 242-249.

Almquist, E. M., & Angrist, S. S. Role model influences on college women's career aspirations. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1971, 17 , 263-279.

Alper, T. G. The relationship between role-orientation and achievement motivation in college women: The Wellesley role-orientation scale. Journal of Personality, 1973, 41, 9-31.

Alper, T. G. Achievement motivation in college women: A now-you-see-it-now-you-don't-phenomenon. American Psychologist, 1974, 29 , 194-203.

Altus, W. D. Birth article and its sequelae. Science, 1965, 151, 44-49.

Altus, W. D. Sex role dissatisfaction, birth order, and parental favoritism. Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1971, 6 (Pt. 1), 161-162. (Summary)

American Council on Education. National norms for entering college freshmen. ACE Research Reports, 1968-1971, 3-6(6).

Anastasi, A., & Schaefer, C. E. Biographical correlates of artistic and literary creativity in adolescent girls. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 267-278.

Anderson, C. A., Bowman, M. J., & Tinto, V. Where colleges are and who attends: Effects of accessibility on college attendance. New York: McGraw Hill, 1972.

Angrist, S. S. Role conception as a predictor of adult female roles. Sociology and Social Research, 1966, 50, 448-459.

Angrist, S. S. Role constellation as a variable in women's leisure activities. Social Forces, 1967, 45, 423-431.

Angrist, S. S. The study of sex roles. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 215-227.

Angrist, S. S. Measuring women's career commitment. Sociological Focus, 1971-1972, 5, 29-39.

Angrist, S. S., & Almquist, E. M. Careers and contingencies. New York: Dunellen, 1975.

Armor, D. J., & Couch, A. S. The data-text primer. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Aronson, H. Life with Cappelli on $101 a week. In L. K. Howe (Ed.), The white majority: Between poverty and affluence. New York: Vintage, 1970.

Astin, H. S. Factors associated with the participation of the woman doctorate in the labor force. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 46, 240-245.

Astin, H. S. Career development of girls during the high school years. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 536-540. (a)

Astin, H. S. Stability and change in the career plans of ninth grade girls. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1968, *46*, 961-966. (b)

Astin, H. S. *The woman doctorate in America*. New York: Russell Sage, 1969.

Astin, H. S., & Bisconti, A. S. *Career plans of college graduates of 1965 and 1970* (Report No. 2). The CPC Foundation, 1973.

Astin, H. S., & Myint, T. Career development of young women during the post-high school years. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1971, *18*, 369-393.

Astin, H. S., Suniewick, N., & Dweck, S. *Women: A bibliography on their education and careers*. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1974.

Axelson, L., The marital adjustment and role definitions of husbands of working and nonworking wives. *Journal of Marriage and Family Living*, 1963, *25*, 189-195.

Backman, C. W., & Secord, P. F. The self and role selection. In C. Gordon & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *The self in social interaction* (Vol. 1). New York: Wiley, 1968.

Bailyn, L. Notes on the role of choice in the psychology of professional women. In R. J. Lifton (Ed.), *The woman in America*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

Bailyn, L. Career and family orientations of husbands and wives in relation to marital happiness. *Human Relations*, 1970, *23*, 97-113.

Banducci, R. The effect of mother's employment on the achievement, aspirations, and expectations of the child. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1967, *46*, 263-267.

Bandura, A. Social-learning theory of identificatory processes. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research*. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1969.

Bank, R. K. *Formulation, application and analysis of a method to study female underachievement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University Graduate School of Education, 1970.

Bardwick, J. M. *Psychology of women*, New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Barnett, R. C. Sex differences and age trends in occupational preference and occupational prestige. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1975, *22*, 35-38.

Barry, H., Bacon, M. K., & Child, I. L. A cross-cultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1957, *55*, 327-332.

Barth, E. A. J., & Watson, W. B. Social stratification and the family in mass society. *Social Forces*, 1967, *45*, 392-402.

Baruch, G. K. Maternal influences upon college women's attitudes toward women and work. *Developmental Psychology*, 1972, *6*, 32-37.

Baruch, G. K. Feminine self-esteem, self-ratings of competence, and maternal career commitment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1973, *20*, 487-488.

Baruch, G. K. Maternal career-orientation as related to parental indentification in college women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1974, *4*, 173-179.

Baruch, R. The achievement motive in women: A study of the implications for career development (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1966). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1967, *28*, 102A. (University Microfilms No. 67-3028)

Baruch, R. The achievement motive in women: Implications for career development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1967, *5*, 260-267.

Baruch, R., Segal, S., & Handrick, F. *Career and family: Variations on a theme*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Studies in Career Development (No. 52), 1967.

Bates, F. L. Position, role and status: A reformulation of concepts. *Social Forces*, 1956, *34*, 313-321.

Bayer, A. E. Life plans and marriage age: An application of path analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1969, *31*, 551-558. (a)

Bayer, A. E. Marriage plans and educational aspirations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1969, *75*, 239-244. (b)

Bayley, N., & Schaefer, E. S. Relationships between socioeconomic status variables and the behavior of mothers toward young children. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1960, *96*, 61-77.

Becker, H. S., & Carper, J. W. The development of identification with an occupation, *American Journal of Sociology*, 1956, *61*, 289-298.

Beier, E. G., & Ratzeburg, F. The parental identifications of male and female college students. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 569-572.

Beilin, H. The pattern of postponability and its relation to social class mobility. Journal of Social Psychology, 1956, 44, 42-43.

Bell, G. D. Processes in the formation of adolescents' aspirations. Social Forces, 1963, 42, 179-186.

Bell, J. B., & Bodden, B. F. Myth of feminist revolution: Future-orientation, career revokability, and role reciprocity among female graduate students. Sociological Focus, 1972, 5, 55-70.

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S. L. Beyond androgyny: Some prescriptions for a liberated sexual identity. In A. S. Skolnick & J. H. Skolnick (Eds.), Family in transition (2nd ed.). Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.

Bem, S. L., & Bem, D. J. Training the woman to know her place: The power of a nonconscious ideology. Women: A Journal of Liberation, Fall 1969, pp. 8-14.

Bereiter, C., & Freedman, M. Fields of study and the people in them. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American college. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Berger, B. M. Working class suburb. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1960.

Bettelheim, B. The problem of generations. In E. H. Erikson (Ed.), Youth: Change and challenge. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Bickel, H. E. An analysis of the work values of women: Implications for counseling (Doctoral dissertation, SUNY Albany, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 29, 3761A. (University Microfilms No. 69-06,688).

Biddle, B. J., & Thomas, E. J. (Eds.). Role theory: Concepts and research. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Biller, H. B. Fathering and female sexual development. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1971, 5, 126-138.

Biller, H. B. Paternal and sex-role factors in cognitive and academic functioning. Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Vol. 21). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1973.

Biller, H., & Weiss, S. D. The father-daughter relationship and the personality development of the female. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1970, 116, 79-92.

Biller, H. B., & Zung, B. Perceived maternal control, anxiety, and opposite sex role preference among elementary school girls. Journal of Psychology, 1972, 81, 85-88.

Bills, R. E., Vance, E. L., & McLean, O. S. An index of adjustment and values. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1951, 15, 257-261.

Bingham, W. C. & House, E. W. ACES' members attitudes towards women and work. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1975, 14, 204-214.

Birk, J. M., & Tanney, M. F. Career exploration for high school women: A model, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 079 662)

Birnbaum, J. L. A. Life patterns, personality style and self-esteem in gifted family-oriented and career-committed women (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 1834B. (University Microfilms No. 71-23, 698)

Blackburn, S. P. S. Relationship of selected variables to occupational and educational aspirations and expectations of female high school seniors (Doctoral dissertation, E. Texas State, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 4152A. (University Microfilms No. 75-01,574)

Blai, B. Job satisfaction and work values for women. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1974, 37, 151-157.

Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. The American occupational structure, New York: Wiley, 1967.

Blau, P. M., Gustad, J. W., Jessor, R., Parnes, H. S., & Wilcock, R. C. Occupational choice: A conceptual framework. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 1956, 8, 531-546.

Blau, Z. S. Maternal aspirations, socialization, and achievement of boys and girls in the white working class. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1972, 1, 35-57.

Blood, R. O., & Hamblin, R. L. The effect of the wife's employment on the family power structure. Social Forces, 1958, 36, 347-352.

Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. Husbands and wives. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.

Bonjean, C. M., Hill, R. J., & McLemore, S. D. Sociological measurement: Inventory of scales and indices. San Francisco: Chandler, 1967.

Bordin, E. S., Nachman, B., & Segal, S. J. An articulated framework for vocational development. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 107-116.

Bordua, D. J. Educational aspirations and parental stress on college. Social Forces, 1960, 38, 262-269.

Bossard, J. H. S. Parent and child. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953.

Bossard, J. H. S. The large family system. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1956.

Bossard, J. H. S., & Boll, E. S. Personality roles in the large family. Child Development, 1955, 26, 71-78.

Bowers, N. D., & Giles, G. C., Jr. Social class, sex and age differences in sex role identity as inferred from children's drawings of men and women. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, 1966.

Boyd, V. A. Aspirations, expectations, and attitudes of South Carolina high school students. South Carolina: Clemson University, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 107 406)

Bradley, R. W., and Sanborn, M. P. Ordinal position of high school students identified by their teachers as superior. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 41-45.

Breedlove, C. J., & Cicirelli, V. G. Woman's fear of success in relation to personal characteristics and type of occupation. Journal of Psychology, 1974, 86, 181-190.

Brim, O. G. Family structure and sex role learning by children: A further analysis of Helen Koch's data. Sociometry, 1958, 21, 1-16.

Brim, O. G. Socialization through the life cycle. In O. G. Brim & S. Wheeler, Socialization after childhood: Two essays. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Socialization and social class through time and space. In E. Maccoby, T. Newcomb, & E. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1958.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Freudian theories of identification and their derivatives. Child Development, 1960, 31, 15-40.

Bronfenbrenner, U. The changing American child - A speculative analysis. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1961, 7, 73-84. (a)

Bronfenbrenner, U. Some familial antecedents of responsibility and leadership in adolescents. In L. Petrullo & B. M. Bass (Eds.), Leadership and interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1961. (b)

Bronson, W. C., Katten, E. S., & Livson, N. Patterns of authority and affection in two generations. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 143-152.

Bronzaft, A. L. College women want a career, marriage, and children. Psychological Reports, 1974, 35, 1031-1034.

Brook, J. S., Whiteman, M., Peisach, E., & Deutsch, M. Aspiration levels of and for children: Age, sex, race, and socioeconomic correlates. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1974, 124, 3-16.

Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P. S., & Vogel, S. R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current reappraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28(2), 59-78.

Brown, D. G. Personality development during the college years: Some educational patterns. Journal of Social Issues, 1956, 12, 44-60.

Brown, D. G. Masculinity-femininity development in children. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 197-202.

Brown, D. G. Sex-role development in a changing culture. Psychological Bulletin, 1958, 55, 232-242.

Bruce, J. A. The role of mothers in the social placement of daughters: Marriage or work. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 492-497.

Bruemmer, L. The condition of women in society today: A review (Pt. I). Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1969, 33, 18-22.

Bruemmer, L. The condition of women in society today: Annotated bibliography (Pt. II). Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1970, 33, 89-95.

Bugental, J. F. T., & Gunning, E. C. Investigations into the self-concept: II. Stability of self-identifications. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1955, 11, 41-46.

Bugental, J. F. T., & Zelen, S. L. Investigations into the self-concept: I. The W-A-Y technique. Journal of Personality, 1950, 18, 483-488.

Butler, J. M., & Haigh, G. V. Changes in relation between self-concepts and ideal concepts consequent upon client-centered counseling. In C. R. Rogers & R. F. Dymond (Eds.). Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 56, 81-105.

Carlson, N. L. Occupational choice and achievement of women graduate students in psychology as a function of early parent-child interactions and achievement as related to birth order and family size (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31, 2679A. (University Microfilms No. 70-25,311)

Carlson, R. Identification and personality structure in preadolescents. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 566-573.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Opportunities for women in higher education, New York: McGraw Hill, 1973.

Caro, F. G. Social class and attitudes of youth relevant for the realization of adult goals. Social Forces, 1966, 44.

Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. SCOPE four-state profile, grades nine and twelve (2 vols.). New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Centers, R. Motivational aspects of occupational stratification. Journal of Social Psychology, 1948, 28, 187-217.

Centers, R. The psychology of social classes. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1949.

Centers, R. Social class, occupation and imputed belief. American Journal of Sociology, 1953, 58, 543-555.

Charters, W. W. The social background of teaching. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), The handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1963.

Chodorow, N. Being and doing: A cross-cultural examination of the socialization of males and females. In V. Gornick & B. K. Moran (Eds.), Woman in sexist society: Studies in power and powerlessness. New York: Signet, 1972.

Christensen, H. T. Lifetime family and occupational role projections of high school students. Marriage and Family Living, 1961, 23, 181-183.

Church, O. Career objectives of Wyoming secondary students compared with parental occupations. Cheyenne, Wyoming: Wyoming State Department of Education, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 105 248).

Clark, B. R. The cooling-out function in higher education. American Sociological Review, 1960, 65, 569-576.

Clark, E. T. Influence of sex and social class on occupational preference and perception. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 440-444.

Cohen, A. K., & Hodges, H. M. Characteristics of the lower-blue-collar class. Social Problems, 1963, 10, 305-323.

Cohen, E. G. Parental factors in educational mobility. Sociology of Education, 1965, 38, 404-425.

Cohen, Y. A. The transition from childhood to adolescence. Chicago: Aldine, 1964.

Coleman, R. P. The index of urban status: A manual for assessing family social class identity. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Joint Center for Urban Studies, 1973.

Coleman, R. P., & Neugarten, B. L. Social status in the city. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Conaway, C. Y., & Niple, M. L. The working patterns of mothers and grandmothers of freshman women at the Ohio State University, 1955 and 1965. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1966, 29, 167-170.

Connell, D. M., & Johnson, J. E. Relationship between sex-role identification and self-esteem in early adolescents. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 199-201.

Cook, B. I. W. Role aspirations as evidenced in senior women (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1967). Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 28, 102A. (University Microfilms No. 67-3028)

Cooley, C. H. Human nature and the social order. New York: Scribner's 1902.

Cope, R. G. Sex-related factors and attrition among college women. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1970, 33, 118-124.

Coser, R. L. Authority and structural ambivalence in the middle-class family. In R. L. Coser (Ed.), The family: Its structure and functions. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.

Cottrell, L. S. The adjustment of the individual to his age and sex roles. American Sociological Review, 1942, 7, 617-620.

Couch, C. J. Family role specialization and self-attitudes in children. Sociological Quarterly, 1962, 3, 115-121.

Counselman, E. F. A comparison of the self-concepts, self-acceptance, ideal self-concepts, and career woman stereotypes of career- and non-career-oriented college senior women (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 1996A. (University Microfilms No. 71-26,689)

Cowan, G., & Moore, L. Female identity and occupational commitment. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Denver, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 056 335)

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. Construct validity in psychological tests. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 281-302.

Cross, K. P. College women: A research description. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1968, 32, 12-21.

Cross, K. P. Beyond the open door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Crowley, J. E., Levitin, T. E., & Quinn, R. P. Seven deadly half truths about women. Psychology Today, March 1973, pp. 94-96.

Daniels, A. K. Feminist perspectives in sociological research. In M. Millman & R. M. Kanter (Eds.), Another voice: Feminist perspectives on social life and social science. Garden City, New York: Anchor, 1975.

Dansereau, H. K. Work and the teen-age blue-collarite. In A. B. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.), Blue-collar world. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Darling, R. W. College women: Do they fit the research description? Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1968, 32, 22-25.

Davis, D., Hagen, N., & Strouf, J. Occupational choice of twelve year-olds. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1962, 40, 628-629.

Davis, E. Careers as concerns of blue-collar girls. In A. B. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.), Blue-collar world. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Davis, J. A. *Great aspirations: The graduate school plans of American college seniors*. Chicago: Aldine, 1964.

Davis, J. A. *Undergraduate career decisions: Correlates of occupational choice*. Chicago: Aldine, 1965.

Davis, J. A. Campus as a frog pond: An application of the theory of relative deprivation to career decisions of college men. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1966, *72*, 17-31.

Defabaugh, G. L. Attitudes of potential professional women towards women: Unconventional occupations (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1975). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1975, *36*, 468B. (University Microfilms No. 75-15,197)

Denzin, N. K. The significant others of a college population. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 1966, *7*, 298-310.

Deutsch, H. *The psychology of women* (2 vols.). New York: Greene and Stratton, 1944-1945.

Diamond, E. E. Occupational interests: Male-female or high level-low level dichotomy? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1971, *1*, 305-315.

Diamond, S. Sex stereotypes and acceptence of sex role. *Journal of Psychology*, 1955, *39*, 385-388.

Dickerson, K. G. Are female college students influenced by the expectations they perceive their faculty and administration have for them? *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, 1974, *37*, 167-172.

Dinklage, L. B. *Adolescent choice and decision-making* (Monograph 2-A). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, Center for Research and Development in Educational Differences, 1967.

Dixit, R. C., & Mathur, M. B. Loving and punishing parental behavior and masculinity-femininity development in school girls. *Journal of Psychological Researches*, 1973, *17*, 47-49.

Dixon, M. M. Adolescent girls tell about themselves. *Marriage and Family Living*, 1958, *20*, 400-401.

Dodson, E. A. The effects of female role models on occupational exploration and attitudes of adolescents (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1974, *34*, 7535A. (University Microfilms No. 74-13,887)

Dole, A. A. Stability of reasons for going to college. Journal of Educational Research, 1970, 63, 373-378.

Douvan, E. Adolescent girls: Their attitudes toward education. In O. D. David (Ed.), The education of women: Signs for the future. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1959.

Douvan, E. Sex differences in adolescent character processes. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 6, 203-211.

Douvan, E. Employment and the adolescent. In F. I. Nye & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), The employed mother in America. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1963.

Douvan, E. New sources of conflict in females at adolescence and early adulthood. In J. M. Bardwick (Ed.), Feminine personality and conflict, Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Douvan, E., & Adelson, J. The adolescent experience. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Douvan, E., & Kaye, C. Motivation factors in college entrance. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American college. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Duncan, O. D. Properties and characteristics of the socioeconomic index. In A. J. Reiss, Jr. (Ed.), Occupations and social status. New York: The Free Press, 1961. (a)

Duncan, O. D. A socioeconomic index for all occupations. In A. J. Reiss, Jr. (Ed.), Occupations and social status. New York: The Free Press, 1961. (b)

Duncan, O. D., Featherman, D. L., & Duncan, B. Socioeconomic background and achievement. New York: Seminar Press, 1972.

Dunham, E. A. Colleges of the forgotten Americans: A profile of state colleges and regional universities, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Dunn, M. S. Marriage role expectations of adolescents. Marriage and Family Living, 1960, 22, 99-111.

Durkheim, E. Suicide. New York: The Free Press, 1951.

Durkheim, E. The division of labor in society. New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Dyer, W. G. Parental influence on the job attitudes of children. Sociology and Social Research, 1958, 42, 203-206.

Dyer, W. G. Family reactions to the father's job. In A. B. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.), Blue-collar world. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Dynes, R. R., Clarke, A. C., & Dinitz, S. Levels of occupational aspiration: Aspects of family experiences as a variable. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 210-218.

Eckland, B. K. Social class and college graduation: Some misconceptions. American Journal of Sociology, 1964, 70, 36-50.

Edwards, A. L. The social desirability variable in personality assessment and research. New York: Holt, 1957. (a)

Edwards, A. L. Techniques of attitude scale construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957. (b)

Edwards, A. L. The measurement of personality traits by scales and inventories. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1970.

Edwards, C. N. Cultural values and role decisions: A study of educated women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 36-40.

Eirich-Cohen, S. Sexual identification, parent identification, and mate selection: An exploration of the theory of complementary needs (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 2164A. (University Microfilms No. 72-29,269)

Eisenstadt, S. N. From generation to generation. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956.

Eisenstadt, S. N. Archetypal patterns of youth. In E. H. Erikson (Ed.), Youth: Change and challenge. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Elliott, E. D. Effects of female role models on occupational aspiration levels of freshman women (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 1075A. (University Microfilms No. 73-21,412)

Elliott, J. L. Family structure and college plans of siblings from blue collar families (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 29, 980A-981A. (University Microfilms No. 68-12,671)

Ellis, E. Social psychological correlates of upward social mobility among unmarried career women. American Sociological Review, 1952, 17, 558-563.

Ellis, R. A., Lane, W. C., & Olesen, V. The index of class position: An improved intercommunity measure of stratification. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 271-277.

Ellis, R. A., & Lane, W. C. Structural supports for upward mobility. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 742-756.

Elton, C. F., & Rose, H. Significance of personality in the vocational choice of college women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 293-298. (a)

Elton, C. F., & Rose, H. Traditional sex attitudes and discrepant abilities in college women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 543. (b)

Emmerich, W. Parental identification in young children. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1959, 60, 257-308.

Emmerich, W. Variations in the parent role as a function of the parent's sex and the child's sex and age. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1962, 8, 1-11.

Empey, L. T. Social class and occupational aspiration: A comparison of absolute and relative measurement. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 703-709.

Empey, L. T. Role expectations of young women regarding marriage and career. Marriage and Family Living, 1958, 20, 152-155.

Entwisle, D. R., & Greenberger, E. A survey of cognitive styles in Maryland ninth graders: IV Views of women's roles. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Study of the Social Organization of Schools, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 043 918)

Epstein, G. F., & Bronzaft, A. L. Female modesty in aspiration level. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 57-60.

Erickson, L. G., & Nordin, M. L. Sex-role ideologies and career salience of college women: A preliminary report. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, Center for Student Development, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 095 449)

Erikson, E. H. Identity and the life cycle. New York: International Press, 1959.

Erikson, E. H. Youth: Fidelity and diversity. In E. H. Erikson (Ed.), Youth: Change and challenge. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Erikson, E. H. Inner and outer space: Reflections on womanhood. In R. J. Lifton (Ed.), The woman in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

Eshleman, J. R., & Hunt, C. L. Social class influences on family adjustment patterns of married college students. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29, 485-491.

Eyde, L. D. *Work values and background factors as predictors of women's desire to work* (Research Monograph No. 108). Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, The Bureau of Business Research, 1962.

Eyde, L. D. Work motivation of women college graduates: Five year follow-up. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1968, *15*, 199-202.

Fagot, B. I. Sex differences in toddlers' behavior and parental reaction. *Developmental Psychology*, 1974, *10*, 554-558.

Fagot, B. I. & Littman, I. Stability of sex role and play interests from pre-school to elementary school. *Journal of Psychology*, 1975. *89*, 285-292.

Falk, L. L. Occupational satisfaction of female college graduates. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1966, *28*, 177-185.

Falk, W. W., & Cosby, A. G. *Women and the status attainment process: A working paper*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Montreal, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 097 237)

Farley, J. Graduate women: Career aspirations and desired family size. *American Psychologist*, 1970, *25*, 1099-1100.

Farmer, H. S., & Bohn, M. J., Jr. Home-career conflict reduction and the level of career interest in women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1970, *17*, 228-232.

Featherman, D. L., Jones, F. L., & Hauser, R. M. *Assumptions of social mobility research in the U.S.: The case of occupational status.* Madison: University of Wisconsin, Institute for Research on Poverty, September, 1974.

Feldman, S. D. *Escape from the doll's house: Women in graduate and professional school education*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1974.

Felson, M., & Knoke, D. Social status and the married woman. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1974, *36*, 516-521.

Finkelman, J. J. Maternal employment, family relationships, and parental role perception (Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1966). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1967, *28*, 2121B. (University Microfilms No. 67-9942)

Fish, K. D., & Biller, H. B. Perceived childhood paternal relationship and college females' personal adjustment. *Adolescence*, 1973, *8*, 415-420.

Fogarty, M. P., Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. Sex, career and family. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1971.

Freedman, M. B. The college experience, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

Freedman, R., & Coombs, L. Economic considerations in family growth decisions. Population Studies, 1966, 20, 197-222.

French, E. G., & Lesser, G. S. Some characteristics of the achievement motive in women. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 119-128.

Frerking, R. A. Occupational status of the mother as a determinent of achievement motivation in women (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 5614B. (University Microfilms No. 75-09,919)

Friedlander, F. Underlying sources of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1963, 47, 246-250.

Gans, H. G. The urban villagers. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Gaskell, J. S. The influence of the feminine role on aspirations. Unpublished special qualifying paper, Harvard University Graduate School of Education, 1971.

Gaskell, J. S. The influence of the feminine role on the aspirations of high school girls (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 7359-7360A. (University Microfilms No. 74-11,322)

Gaskell, J. S. The sex-role ideology of working class girls. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 1975, 12, 453-461.

Geiken, K. F. Expectations concerning husband-wife responsibilities in the home. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1964, 26, 349-352.

Gelso, C. The transmission of attitudes towards child rearing. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1974, 125, 285-294.

Getz, S. K., & Herman, J. B. Sex differences in judgments of male and female role stereotypes. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 099 711)

Gillette, T. L. The working mother: A study of the relationship between maternal employment and family structure as influenced by class and race (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1961). Dissertation Abstracts, 1962, 22, 4111. (University Microfilms No. 61-6108)

Ginn, F. W. Career motivation and role perception of women as related to parental role expectation and parental status discrepancy (Doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of American, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1969, *29*, 4845B. (University Microfilms No. 69-9159)

Ginzberg, E. Paycheck and apron-revolution in woman power. *Industrial Relations*, 1951, *7*, 193-203.

Ginzberg, E. Toward a theory of occupational choice. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1952, *30*, 491-494.

Ginzberg, E., Ginzberg, S. W., Axelrad, S., & Herman, J. L. *Occupational choice*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

Ginzberg, E., & Yohalem, A. M. *Educated American women: Self-portraits*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Glick, P. C. A demographer looks at American families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1975, *37*, 15-26.

Goffman, E. *The presentation of self in every day life*. Garden City, New Jersey: Doubleday-Anchor, 1959.

Goffman, E. *Encounters: Two studies in the sociology of interaction*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961.

Gold, A. R. Reexamining barriers to women's career development. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1978, *48*, 690-702.

Goldberg, R. E. Sex role stereotypes and career versus homemaking orientations of women. In S. H. Osipow (Ed.), *Emerging woman: Career analysis and outlooks*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1975.

Goldschmidt, J., Gergen, M. M., Quigley, K., & Gergen, K. J. The women's liberation movement: Attitudes and action. *Journal of Personality*, 1974, *42*, 601-617.

Goode, W. J. A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review*, 1960, *25*, 483-496.

Gordon, C. Self-conceptions: Configurations of content. In C. Gordon & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *The self in social interaction* (Vol. 1). New York: Wiley, 1968.

Gordon, F. E., & Hall, D. T. Self-image and stereotypes of femininity: Their relationship to women's role conflicts and coping. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1974, *59*, 241-243.

Gorsuch, R. L. *Factor analysis*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1974.

Gottleib, D. *Youth and the meaning of work* (Part II). Houston: University of Texas, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 108 530)

Gover, D. A. A socioeconomic differential in the relationship between marital adjustment and wife's employment status. *Journal of Marriage and Family Living*, 1963, *25*, 452-458.

Gray, S. Perceived similarity to parents and adjustment. *Child Development*, 1959, *30*, 91-107.

Gray, S., & Klaus, R. The assessment of parental identification. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 1956, *54*, 87-114.

Greeley, A. M. *Religion and career: A study of college graduates*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1963.

Greeley, A. M. *The American Catholic*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Greeley, A. M., & Rossi, P. H. *The education of Catholic Americans*. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.

Greenhaus, J. H. An investigation of the role of career salience in vocational behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1971, *1*, 209-216.

Greenhaus, J. H. A factorial investigation of career salience. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1973, *3*, 95-98.

Grigg, A. E. Childhood experiences and parental attitudes: A test of Roe's hypothesis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1959, *6*, 153-156.

Grinder, R. E., & Spector, J. C. Sex differences in adolescents' perceptions of parental resource control. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1965, *106*, 337-344.

Gross, E. *Work and society*. New York: Crowell, 1958.

Gross, E. A sociological approach to the analysis of preparation for work life. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1967, *45*, 416-423.

Gross, E. Plus ca change . . .? The sexual structure of occupations over time. *Social Problems*, 1968, *16*, 198-208.

Gross, N., Mason, W., & McEachern, A. *Explorations in role analysis: Studies of the school superintendent's role*. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Guba, E., Jackson, P. H., & Bidwell, C. E. Occupational choice and the teaching career. In W. W. Charters & N. L. Gage (Eds.), *Readings in the social psychology of education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1963.

Gump, J. P. Sex-role attitudes and psychological well-being. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1972, *28*, 79-92.

Gutman, D. Female ego styles and generational conflict. In J. M. Bardwick (Ed.), Feminine personality and conflict. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Guttmacher, M. J. Occupational choice as a response to environmental press: A case study of teaching aspirants. Unpublished special qualifying paper, Harvard University Graduate School of Education, 1971.

Gysbers, N. C., Johnston, J. A., & Gust, T. Characteristics of homemaker- and career-oriented women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 541-546.

Haavio-Mannila, E. Sex differentiation in role expectations and performance. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29, 568-578.

Hagen, D. H. Family atmosphere and other childhood patterns as precursors of career interests. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1959.

Hagen, D. Careers and family atmosphere: A test of Roe's theory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 251-256.

Halas, C. M. Sex-role stereotypes: Perceived childhood socialization experiences and the attitudes and behavior of adult women. Journal of Psychology, 1974, 88, 261-275.

Hall, B. A. Occupational values and family perspectives: A study of premed and prenursing women (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 2407A (University Microfilms No. 74-22,349)

Hall, D. T. A model of coping with role conflict: The role behavior of college educated women. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972, 17, 471-486.

Hall, D. T. Pressure from work, self, and home in the life stages of married women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1975, 6, 121-132.

Hall, D. T., & Gordon, F. E. The career choices of married women: Effects on conflict, role behavior, and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 58, 42-48.

Hamilton, R. F. The behavior and values of skilled workers. In A. B. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.), Blue-collar world. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Handel, G., & Rainwater, L. Persistance and change in working-class life style. In A. B. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.), Blue-collar world. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Hanley, M. A. Factors of achievement and femininity as predictors of career commitment in college senior women (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 2050A. (University Microfilms No. 74-20,435)

Hanson, J. C. Feminine role values and personality factors among women's liberation members, college women seeking personal counseling, and other college women. (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 6456A. (University Microfilms No. 75-07,453)

Harmon, L. W. Women's interests - fact or fiction. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 895-900. (a)

Harmon, L. W. Women's working patterns related to their SVIB Housewife and 'Own' Occupational Scores. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 299-301. (b)

Harmon, L. W. The predictive power over ten years of measured social service and scientific interests among college women. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 193-198.

Harmon, L. W. Anatomy of career commitment in women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 77-80.

Harmon, L. W. The childhood and adolescent career plans of college women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1971, 1, 45-56.

Harmon, L. W. Variables related to women's persistence in educational plans. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1972, 2, 143-153.

Hartley, R. Children's concepts of male and female roles. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 3, 83-91. (a)

Hartley, R. Some implications of current change in sex role patterns. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 3, 153-164. (b)

Hartley, R. Current patterns in sex-role: Children's perspectives. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1961, 25, 3-13. (a)

Hartley, R. Sex role and urban youth: Some developmental perspectives. Bulletin of Family Development, 1961, 2, 1-12. (b)

Hartley, R. Children's perceptions of sex roles in childhood. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1964, 105, 43-51. (a)

Hartley, R. A developmental view of female sex-role definition and identification. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 1964, *10*, 3-16. (b)

Hartley, R., & Klein, A. Sex-role concepts among elementary-school-age girls. *Marriage and Family Living*, 1959, *21*, 59-64.

Haug, M. *Supplement to Hollingshead*. Unpublished manuscript, Case Western Reserve University, Institute on the Family in a Bureaucratic Society, January 1973.

Haug, M. R. Sex role variations in occupational prestige ratings. *Sociological Focus*, 1975, *8*, 47-56.

Hauser, R. M. Context and consex: A cautionary tale. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1970, *75*, 645-664.

Havighurst, R. J. Education, social mobility, and social change in four societies. In R. R. Bell & H. R. Stub (Eds.), *The sociology of education: A sourcebook*. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1968.

Hawley, P. What women think men think: Does it affect their career choice? *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1971, *18*, 193-199.

Hedges, J. N. Women workers and manpower demands in the 1970's. *Monthly Labor Review*, June 1970.

Heer, D. M. Dominance and the working wife. *Social Forces*, 1957, *36*, 347-352.

Heilbrun, A. B. Sex role identity and achievement motivation. *Psychological Reports*, 1963, *12*, 483-490.

Heilbrun, A. B. Parental model attributes, nurturant reinforcement and consistency of behavior in adolescents. *Child Development*, 1964, *35*, 151-167.

Heilbrun, A. B. Sex differences in identification learning. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1965, *106*, 185-193.

Heilbrun, A. B. Sex-role identity in adolescent females: A theoretical paradox. *Adolescence*, 1968, *3*, 79-88.

Heilbrun, A. B. Parental identification and the pattern of vocational interests in college males and females. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1969, *16*, 342-347.

Heilbrun, A. B. Parental identification and educational dissatisfaction in troubled college students. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1973, *122*, 183-188.

Heilbrun, C. G. Educating female people. *Columbia University Forum*, 1962, *5*, 33-37.

Heist, P. Motivation of college women today: A closer look. *Journal of the American Association of University Women*, 1962, *56*, 17-19.

Helson, R. Personality characteristics and developmental history of creative college women. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 1967, *76*, 205-256.

Helson, R. Effects of sibling characteristics and parental values on creative interests and achievement. *Journal of Personality*, 1968, *36*, 589-607.

Helson, R. Women mathematicians and the creative personality. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1971, *36*, 210-220.

Helson, R. The changing image of the career woman. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1972, *28*, 33-46.

Herriott, R. E. Some social determinants of educational aspiration. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1963, *33*, 157-177.

Hess, R. D., & Torney, J. V. Religion, age, and sex in children's perceptions of family authority. *Child Development*, 1962, *33*, 781-789.

Hetherington, E. M. A developmental study of the effects of sex of the dominant parent on sex-role preference, identification, and imitation in children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1965, *2*, 188-194.

Hewer, V. H., & Neubeck, G. Attitudes of college students toward employment among married women. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1964, *42*, 587-592.

Hochschild, A. R. A review of sex role research. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1973, *78*, 1011-1029.

Hodge, R. W., & Siegel, P. M. The classification of occupations: Some problems of sociological interpretation. *Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, American Statistical Association*, 1966, pp. 176-192.

Hoffman, D. S., & Hoeflin, R. Freshman and sophomore women: What do they want most in the future? *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1972, *13*, 490-493.

Hoffman, L. W. Effects of the employment of mothers on parental power relations and the division of household tasks. *Marriage and Family Living*, 1960, *22*, 27-35.

Hoffman, L. W. The decision to work. In F. I. Nye & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), *The employed mother in America*. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1963. (a)

Hoffman, L. W. Effects on children: Summary and discussion. In F. I. Nye & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), *The employed mother in America*. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1963. (b)

Hoffman, L. W. Early childhood experiences and women's achievement motives. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1972, *28*, 129-156.

Holland, J. L. A theory of vocational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1959, *6*, 35-45.

Holland, J. L. *The psychology of vocational choice: A theory of personality types and model environments*. Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell, 1966.

Hollander, J. Sex differences in sources of social self-esteem. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1972, *38*, 343-347.

Hollingshead, A. B. *Two factor index of social position*. New Haven: Yale University, 1965.

Hollingshead, A. B., & Redlich, F. *Social class and mental illness*. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Holmstrom, L. L. Career patterns of married couples. In A. Theodore (Ed.), *The professional woman*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman, 1971.

Horner, M. S. Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance in competitive and noncompetitive situations (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1969, *30*, 407B. (University Microfilms No. 69-12,135)

Horner, M. S. Fail: Bright women. *Psychology Today*, 1969, *3*, 36-38; 62.

Horner, M. S. Femininity and successful achievement: A basic inconsistency. In J. M. Bardwick (Ed.), *Feminine personality and conflict*. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Horner, M. S. The motive to avoid success and changing aspirations of college women. In J. M. Bardwick (Ed.), *Readings in the psychology of women*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972. (a)

Horner, M. S. Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1972, *28*, 157-175. (b)

Houts, P. S., & Entwisle, D. R. Academic achievement effort among females: Achievement attitudes and sex role orientation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1968, *15*, 284-286.

Hoyt, D. P., & Kennedy, C. E. Interest and personality correlates of career-motivated and homemaking-motivated college women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1958, *5*, 44-49.

Hughes, E. *Men and their work*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.

Hunt, J. G., & Hunt, L. L. The sexual mystique: A common dimension of racial and sexual stratification. *Sociology and Social Research*, 1975, *59*, 231-242.

Husbands, S. A. Women's place in education? *School Review*, 1972, *80*, 261-274.

Hyman, H. H. The value systems of different classes: A social psychological contribution to the analysis of stratification. In R. Bendix & S. M. Lipset (Eds.), *Class, status and power: Social stratification in comparative perspective* (2nd ed.). New York: The Free Press, 1966.

Inkeles, A. Social change and social character: The role of parental mediation. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1955, *11*(2), 12-23.

Institutional self-evaluation. Massachusetts: 1971.

Jacobson, R. L. Job market for teachers: Better times ahead? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 26, 1979, p. 7.

Jaffe, A. J., & Adams, W. College education for U.S. youth: The attitudes of parents and children. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 1964, *25*, 269-283.

Jahoda, M., & Havel, J. Psychological problems of women in different social roles. *Educational Record*, 1955, *36*, 325-335.

Jardine, L. L., & Wursler, S. R. *A study of attitudes of twelfth grade students toward high-success-oriented college/career goals of females*, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 087 969)

Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M. J., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., & Michelson, S. *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Johnson, M. M. Sex role learning in the nuclear family. *Child Development*, 1963, *34*, 319-333.

Johnson, N. E., & Stokes, C. S. *Family size in successive generations: The effects of birth order, intergenerational change in life style, and familial satisfaction*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, San Francisco, August, 1975.

Johnson, R. W. Parental identification and vocational interests of college women. Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 1970, 3, 147-152.

Jourard, S. M. Identification, parent-cathexis, and self-esteem. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 375-380.

Jourard, S. M., & Lasakow, P. Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 56, 91-98.

Jourard, S. M., & Richman, P. Factors in the self-disclosure inputs of college students. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 141-148.

Kagan, J. The concept of identification. Psychological Review, 1958, 65, 296-305.

Kagan, J. Acquisition and significance of sex typing and sex role identity. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 1). New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

Kagan, J. The emergence of sex differences. School Review, 1972, 80, 217-227.

Kagan, J., & Freeman, M. Relation of childhood intelligence, maternal behaviors, and social class to behavior during adolescence. Child Development, 1963, 34, 899-911.

Kagan, J. & Lemkin, J. The child's differential perception of parental attributes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 440-447.

Kagan, J., & Moss, H. A. Birth to maturity. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Kahl, J. A. Educational and occupational aspirations of "common man" boys. Harvard Educational Review, 1953, 23, 186-203.

Kahl, J. A., & Davis, J. A. A comparison of indexes of socioeconomic status. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 317-325.

Kammeyer, K. The feminine role: An analysis of attitude consistency. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1964, 26, 295-305.

Kammeyer, K. Birth order and the feminine sex role among college women. American Sociological Review, 1966, 31, 508-515.

Kammeyer, K. Sibling position and the feminine role. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29, 494-499.

Kandel, D., & Lesser, G. S. School, family and peer influences on educational plans of adolescents in the U.S. and Denmark. Sociology of Education, 1970, 43, 270-287.

Kaplan, H. B., & Pokorny, A. D. Sex-related correlates of adult self-derogation: Reports of childhood experiences. *Developmental Psychology*, 1972, *6*, 536.

Karman, F. J. *Women: Personal and environmental factors in role identification and career choice* (Report No. CSE-89). Los Angeles: UCLA, Center for the Study of Evaluation, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 084 383)

Katz, J. Career and autonomy in college women. In J. Katz (Ed.), *Class, character, and career*, Stanford, California: Stanford University, Institute for the Study of Human Problems, 1969.

Kemper, T. D. Self-conceptions and the expectations of significant others. *Sociological Quarterly*, 1966, *7*, 323-343.

Kemper, T. D. Reference groups, socialization and achievement. *American Sociological Review*, 1968, *33*, 31-45.

Keniston, K., & Keniston, E. An American anachronism: The image of women and work. *American Scholar*, 1964, *33*, 355-375.

Kennedy, J. J., Jr. Familial and cultural factors influencing the occupational choice of women who are high academic achievers (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1972). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1972, *33*, 570A. (University Microfilms No. 72-20,677)

Kerckhoff, A. C., & Huff, J. L. Parental influence on educational goals. *Sociometry*, 1974, *37*, 307-327.

King, K., McIntyre, J., & Axelson, L. J. Adolescents' views of maternal employment as a threat to the marital relationship. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1968, *30*, 633-637.

Kinnane, J. F., & Bannon, M. M. Perceived parental influence and work value orientation. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1964, *43*, 273-279.

Kinnane, J. F., & Grauberger, J. R. Life values and work values. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1963, *10*, 362-367.

Kinnane, J. F., & Pable, M. W. Family background and work value orientation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1962, *9*, 320-325.

Kirchner, E. P., & Vandracek, S. I. *What do you want to be when you grow up? Vocational choice in children ages 3-6*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Philadelphia, March 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 076 244)

Klemmack, D. L., & Edwards, J. N. Women's acquisition of stereotyped occupational aspirations. *Sociology and Social Research*, 1973, *57*, 510-525.

Kluckhohn, F. R. American women and American values. In L. Bryson (Ed.), *Facing the future's risks*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953.

Kohn, M. L. Social class and the exercise of parental authority. *American Sociological Review*, 1959, *24*, 352-366.

Kohn, M. L. Social class and parent-child relationships: An interpretation. In F. Riessman, J. Cohen, & A. Pearl (Eds.), *Mental health of the poor*. London: The Free Press, 1964. (a)

Kohn, M. L. Social class and parental values. In R. L. Coser (Ed.), *The family: Its structure and functions*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964. (b)

Kohn, M. L., & Carroll, E. E. Social class and the allocation of parental responsibility. *Sociometry*, 1960, *23*, 378-392.

Komarovsky, M. Cultural contradictions and sex roles. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1946, *52*, 184-189.

Komarovsky, M. Functional analysis of sex roles. *American Sociological Review*, 1950, *15*, 508-516.

Komarovsky, M. *Women in the modern world*, Boston: Little, Brown, 1953.

Komarovsky, M. The homemaker: A comparative view. *Journal of the American Association of University Women*, 1962, *55*, 226-229.

Komarovsky, M. *Blue-collar marriage*. New York: Vintage Books, 1967.

Komarovsky, M. Blue-collar marriages and families. In L. K. Howe (Ed.), *The white majority: Between poverty and affluence*. New York: Vintage, 1970.

Komarovsky, M. Cultural contradictions and sex roles: The masculine case. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1973, *78*, 873-884.

Krauss, I. Sources of educational aspirations among working-class youth. *American Sociological Review*, 1964, *29*, 867-879.

Kriger, S. F. Need achievement and perceived parental child-rearing attitudes of career women and homemakers (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1972, *32*, 6621B. (University Microfilms No. 72-15,235)

Kriger, S. F. Need achievement and perceived parental child rearing attitudes of career women and homemakers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1972, *2*, 419-432.

Kuhn, M. H. Self-attitudes by age, sex, and professional training. Sociological Quarterly, 1960, 1, 39-55.

Kuhn, M. H., & McPartland, T. S. An empirical investigation of self-attitudes. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 68-76.

Labovitz, S. The assignment of numbers to rank order categories. American Sociological Review, 1970, 35, 515-524.

Labovitz, S. Statistical usage in sociology: Sacred cows and ritual. Sociological Methods and Research, 1972, 1, 13-38.

Landreth, C. Four year-olds' notions about sex appropriateness of parental care and companionship activities. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 175-182.

Lansky, L. M., Crandall, V. J., Kagan, J., & Baker, C. T. Sex differences in aggression and its correlates in middle-class adolescents. Child Development, 1961, 32, 45-58.

Larson, D. L., & Spreitzer, E. A. Education, occupation, and age as correlates of work orientation. Psychological Reports, 1973, 33, 879-884.

Laws, J. L. Work aspiration of women: False leads and new starts. In M. Blaxall & B. Reagan (Eds.), Women and the workplace. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Lefton, M. The blue collar worker and the middle class ethic. Sociology and Social Research, 1967, 51, 158-170.

Lefton, M., Angrist, S., Dinitz, S., & Pasamanick, B. Social class, expectations and performance of mental patients. American Journal of Sociology, 1962, 58, 79-87.

Lehman, I. J., Sinha, B. K., & Hartnett, R. T. Changes in attitudes and values associated with college attendance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1966, 57(3), 89-98.

LeMasters, E. E. Blue-collar aristocrats. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1975.

Lenski, G. E. Status crystallization: A non-vertical dimension of social status. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 405-413.

Lesser, G. S., Kravitz, R., & Packard, R. Experimental arousal of achievement motivation in adolescent girls. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 59-66.

Levine, A. G. Marital and occupational plans of women in professional schools: Law, medicine, nursing, teaching (Doctoral dissertation, Yale, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30, 829A. (University Microfilms No. 69-13,353)

Levine, A. G. Forging a feminine identity: Women in four professional schools. American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1975, 35, 63-67.

Levinson, D. Role, personality, and social structure in the organizational setting. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 170-180.

Levitt, E. A. Vocational development of professional women: A review. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1972, 2, 375-385.

Lewis, E. C. Counselors and girls. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 159-166.

Lewis, E. C. Developing women's potential. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1968.

Lewis, E. C. Choice and conflict for the college woman. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1969, 32, 176-182.

Lewis, Leon. Development of a convertability index between the DOT and census classification schemes. Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, American Statistical Association, 1966, pp. 204-206.

Lewis, R. O., Jr. Consistent career preferences, personality and women's perceptions of male views of femininity (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 7062A. (University Microfilms No. 75-11,386)

Lidz, Theodore. The person: His development throughout the life cycle. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Linton, R. Age and sex categories. American Sociological Review, 1942, 7, 589-603.

Lipman-Blumen, J. Implications for family-structure of changing sex-roles. Social Casework, 1976, 57(2), 67-79.

Lipset, S. M., & Bendix, R. Social mobility in an industrial society. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1963.

Litwak, E. Geographic mobility and extended family cohesion. American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 385-394. (a)

Litwak, E. Occupational mobility and extended family cohesion. *American Sociological Review*, 1960, *25*, 9-21. (b)

Lopata, H. Z. The life cycle of the social role of housewives. *Sociology and Social Research*, 1966, *51*, 5-22.

Losciuto, L. A., & Karlin, R. M. Correlates of the generation gap. *Journal of Psychology*, 1972, *81*, 253-262.

Lueptow, L. B. Parental status and influence and the achievement orientations of high school seniors. *Sociology of Education*, 1975, *48*, 91-110.

Lurie, E. E. Sex and stage differences in perceptions of marital and family relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1974, *36*, 260-269.

Lynn, D. B. A note on sex differences in the development of masculine and feminine identification. *Psychological Review*, 1959, *66*, 126-135.

Lynn, D. B. Sex differences in identification development. *Sociometry*, 1961, *24*, 372-381.

Lynn, D. B. Sex-role and parental identification. *Child Development*, 1962, *33*, 555-564.

Lynn, D. B., & Sawrey, W. L. Sex differences in the personality development of Norwegian children. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1962, *101*, 367-374.

Maccoby, E. E. Sex differences in intellectual functioning. In E. E. Maccoby (Ed.), *The development of sex differences*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1974.

MacKinnon, D. W. Personality and the realization of creative potential. *American Psychologist*, 1965, *20*, 273-281.

Mahoney, J. An analysis of the axiological structures of traditional and proliberation men and women. *Journal of Psychology*, 1975, *90*, 31-39.

Mainardi, P. The politics of housework. In R. Morgan (Ed.), *Sisterhood is powerful*. New York: Vintage, 1970.

Malpass, R. S., & Symonds, J. D. *Value preferences are more strongly associated with social class than with sex or race* (Technical Report No. 17). Illinois: Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 072 151)

Marciano, T. D. Middle-class incomes, working-class hearts. *Family Process*, 1974, *13*, 489-502.

Margolin, G., & Patterson, G. R. Differential consequences provided by mothers and fathers for their sons and daughters. *Developmental Psychology*, 1975, *11*, 537-538.

Marks, S. R. Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review*, 1977, *42*, 921-936.

Martin, W. L., & Postori, D. L., Jr. The occupational composition of white females: Sexism, racism and occupational differentiation. *Social Forces*, 1972, *50*, 349-355.

Masih, L. K. Career saliency and its relation to certain needs, interests and job values. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1967, *45*, 653-658.

Mason, W. S. *The beginning teacher: Status and career orientations* (OE-23009, Circular No. 644). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

Mason, W. S., Dressel, R. J., & Bain, R. K. Sex role and the career orientations of beginning teachers. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1959, *29*, 370-383.

Matthews, E. *Elements of a theory of career development for girls*. Unpublished special paper, Harvard University Graduate School of Education, 1957.

Matthews, E. Personalizing occupational freedom for girls and women. *Proceedings of the Rutgers Guidance Conference*, October 1970 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 075 734)

Matthews, E., & Tiedeman, D. V. Attitudes toward career and marriage and the development of life style in young women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1964, *11*, 375-384.

Mayer, K. B. *Class and society*. New York: Random House, 1955.

Mayer, K. B. The changing shape of the American class structure. *Social Research*, 1963, *30*, 458-468.

McArthur, C. Personality differences between middle and upper classes. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1955, *50*, 247-254.

McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. *The achievement motive*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

McDill, E. L., & Coleman, J. S. Family and peer influences in college plans of high school students. *Sociology of Education*, 1965, *38*, 118-119.

McKee, J. P., & Sherriffs, A. C. The differential evaluation of males and females. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 356-371.

McKinley, D. G. Social class and family life. New York: The Free Press, 1964.

McLaughlin, B. S. Identity and personality: A study of self-perceived identity in college students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1965.

McLaughlin, B. S. The WAI dictionary and self-perceived identity in college students. In P. J. Stone, D. C. Dunphy, M. S. Smith, & D. M. Ogilvie (Eds.), The general inquirer: A computer approach to content analysis. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1966.

McMillan, S. R. Aspirations of low-income mothers. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29, 282-287.

McPartland, T. S., Cumming, J. H., & Garretson, W. S. Self-conception and ward behavior in two psychiatric hospitals. Sociometry, 1961, 24, 111-124.

McTavish, D. G. A method for more reliably coding detailed occupations into Duncan's socioeconomic categories. American Sociological Review, 1964, 29, 402-406.

Mead, G. H. Mind, self, and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Mead, M. Male and female. New York: Mentor, 1955.

Mednick, M. S., & Tangri, S. S. New social psychological perspectives on women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28(2), 1-16.

Mednick, M. T., & Weissman, H. J. The psychology of women: Selected topics. Annual Review of Psychology, 1975, 26, 1-18.

Medsker, L. L., & Trent, J. W. The influence of different types of public higher institutions on college attendance from varying socioeconomic and ability levels. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley, Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1965.

Medvene, A. M., & Collins, A. Occupational prestige and its relationship to traditional and nontraditional views of women's roles. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 139-143.

Meier, H. C. Status and sex variation in modes of parental influence on students' decisions to go to college. Sociological Focus, 1969, 3, 25-54.

Meier, H. C. Mother-centeredness and college youth's attitudes toward social equality for women: Some empirical findings. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 115-121.

Meir, E. I. Relationship between intrinsic needs and women's persistence at work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 293-296.

Merton, R. K. Social theory and social structure (Rev. ed.). New York: The Free Press, 1957.

Messer, S. B., & Lewis, M. Social class and sex differences in the attachment and play behavior of the year old infant. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1972, 18, 295-306.

Metzger, S. M., Bollman, S. R., Hoeflin, R. M., & Schmalzried, B. A. Comparison of life styles of honors, non-honors women. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1969, 47, 671-674.

Michaelson, B. L. Vocational interests, self-concepts,and attitudes toward feminine roles as related to the educational and vocational choices of college women (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 2994B. (University Microfilms No. 74-28,242)

Miller, M. F. Relationship of vocational maturity to work values. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 5, 367-371.

Miller, S. M. The American lower classes: A typological approach. In F. Riessman, J. Cohen, & A. Pearl (Eds.), Mental health of the poor. London: The Free Press, 1964. (a)

Miller, S. M. The "new" working class. In A. B. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.), Blue-collar-world. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964. (b)

Miller, S. M., & Riessman, F. Are workers middle class? Dissent, 1961, 8, 507-513. (a)

Miller, S. M., & Riessman, F. The working-class subculture: A new view. Social Problems, 1961, 9, 86-97. (b)

Miller, Shirley M. Effects of maternal employment on sex role perceptions, interests, and self-esteem in kindergarten girls. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 405-406.

Mishler, S. A. Barriers to the career development of women. In S. H. Osipow (Ed.), Emerging woman: Career analysis and outlooks. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1975.

Miyahira, S. D. Marriage and the employment of women. In S. H. Osipow (Ed.), Emerging woman: Career analysis and outlooks. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1975.

Miyamoto, S. F., & Dornbusch, S. M. A test of interactionist hypotheses of self-conception. American Journal of Sociology, 1956, 61, 399-403.

Moore, K. M. The cooling out of two-year college women. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1975, 53, 578-583.

Moore, W. E. Occupational socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1969.

Moser, C. A., & Kalton, G. Survey methods in social investigation (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Mostow, E., & Newberry, P. Work role and depression in women: A comparison of workers and housewives in treatment. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1975, 45, 538-548.

Motz, A. B. Concepts of marital roles by status groups. Marriage and Family Living, 1950, 12, 136; 162.

Motz, A. B. A role conception inventory: A tool for research. American Sociological Review, 1952, 17, 465-471.

Mulvey, M. Psychological and sociological factors in the prediction of career patterns of women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1961.

Mussen, P. Long-term consequents of masculinity of interests in adolescence. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 435-440.

Mussen, P., & Rutherford, E. Parent-child relations and parental personality in relation to young children's sex-role preferences. Child Development, 1963, 34, 589-607.

Nagely, D. L. A comparison of college educated working mothers in traditional and nontraditional occupations. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1971, 1, 331-341.

Nevill, D., & Damico, S. Family size and role conflict in women. Journal of Psychology, 1975, 89, 267-270.

Nichols, R. C. Subtle, obvious and stereotype measures of masculinity-femininity. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1962, 22, 449-461.

North, C. C., & Hatt, P. H. Jobs and occupations: A popular evaluation. In R. Bendix & S. M. Lipset (Eds.), Class, status and power: A reader in social stratification (1st ed.). Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953.

Norton, J. L. Patterns of vocational interest development and actual job choice. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1953, *82*, 235-262.

Norton, J. L. Current status of research on vocational development. In H. J. Peters & J. C. Hansen (Eds.), *Vocational guidance and career development* (2nd Ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1971.

Nuzum, R. E. Inferred parental identification and perceived parental relationships as related to career-orientation and homemaking-orientation in above-average ability college women (Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1970). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1970, *31*, 2689A-2690A. (University Microfilms No. 70-24,992)

O'Connor, J. P., & Kinnane, J. F. A factor analysis of work values. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1961, *8*, 263-267.

O'Hara, R. P. The roots of careers. *Elementary School Journal*, 1962, *62*, 277-280.

O'Leary, V. E. Some attitudinal barriers to occupational aspirations in women. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1974, *81*, 809-826.

Oliver, L. W. Achievement and affiliation motivation in career-oriented and homemaking-oriented college women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1974, *4*, 275-281.

Oppenheimer, M. White collar revisited: The making of a new working class. *Social Policy*, July/August 1970, pp. 27-32.

Oppenheimer, V. K. The sex-labeling of jobs. *Industrial Relations*, 1968, *7*, 219-234.

Oppenheimer, V. K. The sociology of women's economic role in the family. *American Sociological Review*, 1977, *42*, 387-406.

Orden, S. R., & Bradburn, N. M. Working wives and marriage happiness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1969, *74*, 392-407.

Osipow, S. H. *Theories of career development*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Osipow, S. H., Concepts in considering women's careers. In S. H. Osipow (Ed.), *Emerging woman: Career analysis and outlooks*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1975.

Paine, F. T., Deutsch, D. R., & Smith, R. A. Relationship between family backgrounds and work values. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1967, *51*, 320-323.

Parelius, A. P. Change and stability in college women's orientations toward education, family, and work. *Social Problems*, 1975, *22*, 420-431. (a)

Parelius, A. P. Emerging sex-role attitudes, expectations, and strains among college women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1975, *37*, 146-153. (b)

Parker, A. W. Career and marriage orientation in the vocational development of college women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1966, *50*, 232-235.

Parsons, T. Age and sex in the social structure of the United States. *American Sociological Review*, 1942, *7*, 604-612.

Parsons, T. Outline of the social system. In T. Parsons, E. Shils, K. D. Naegele, & J. R. Pitts (Eds.), *Theories of society* (Vol. 1). Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.

Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. *Family, socialization and interaction process*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

Patterson, L. E. Girls' careers - Expression of identity. *Vocational Guidance Quaterly*, 1973, *21*, 269-275.

Pavalko, R. M. Aspirants to teaching: Some differences between high school boys and girls planning a career in teaching. In R. M. Pavalko (Ed.), *Sociology of Education: A Book of Readings*. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1968.

Pearlin, L. I., & Kohn, M. L. Social class, occupation, and parental values: A cross-national study. *American Sociological Review*, 1966, *31*, 466-479.

Peoples, V. Y. Measuring the vocational interest of young women. In S. H. Osipow (Ed.), *Emerging woman: Career analysis and outlooks*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1975.

Perrone, P. A. A longitudinal study of occupational values in adolescents. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, 1973, *22*, 116-123.

Peterson, E. T. The impact of maternal employment on the mother-daughter relationship. *Marriage and Family Living*, 1961, *23*, 355-361.

Pfeil, E. Role expectation when entering into marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1968, 30, 161-165.

Picou, J. S., & Curry, E. W. Structural, interpersonal, and behavioral correlates of female adolescents' occupational choices. Adolescence, 1973, 8, 421-432.

Podell, L. Sex and role conflict. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1966, 28, 163-165.

Podell, L. Occupational and familial role-expectations. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29, 492-493.

Poloma, M. M., & Garland, T. N. The myth of the egalitarian family: Familial roles and the professionally employed wife. In A. Theodore (Ed.), The professional woman. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman, 1971.

Pope, S. K. Effects of female career role models on occupational aspirations, attitudes, and personalities of high school seniors (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 4964A. (University Microfilms No. 72-10,648)

Powell, M., & Bloom, V. Development of reasons for vocational choices of adolescents through the high school years. Journal of Educational Research, 1962, 56, 126-133.

Price, R. K. A study of marriage role expectations of women living in Missouri Delta counties as related to selected characteristics. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri at Columbia, not dated. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 068 750) (Summary)

Psathas, G. Toward a theory of occupational choice for women. Sociology and Social Research, 1968, 52, 253-268.

Rabban, M. Sex-role identification in young children in two diverse social groups. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1950, 42, 81-158.

Rainwater, L., Coleman, R. P., & Handel, G. Workingman's wife. New York: Oceana Publications, 1959.

Rainwater, L., & Handel, G. Changing family roles in the working class. In A. B. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.), Blue-collar world. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Rand, L. M. Masculinity or femininity? Differentiating career-oriented and homemaking-oriented college freshmen women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 444-450.

Rand, L. M., & Miller, A. L. A developmental cross-sectioning of women's careers and marriage attitudes and life plans. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1972, 2, 317-331.

Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. Dual-career families. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1971. (a)

Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. Early and later experiences as determinants of adult behavior: Married women's family and career patterns. British Journal of Sociology, 1971, 22, 16-30. (b)

Rapoport, R. N., & Rapoport, R. Work and family in contemporary society. American Sociological Review, 1965, 30, 381-394.

Rappaport, A. F., Payne, D., & Steinmann, A. Perceptual differences between married and single college women for the concepts of self, ideal woman, and man's ideal woman. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 441-442.

Reed, T. L. The reference groups for educational achievement among culturally deprived junior high school students: A theoretical discussion and preliminary data. Unpublished masters thesis, Oberlin College, 1966.

Regan, C. A. B. Attitudes towards parents and achievement motivation of freshmen women in a selective urban university in relation to mothers' career patterns (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 6738A. (University Microfilms No. 73-13,458)

Rehberg, R. A., Sinclair, J., & Schafer, W. E. Adolescent achievement behavior, family authority structure, and parental socialization practices. American Journal of Sociology, 1970, 75, 1012-1034.

Reiss, A. J., Jr. Scaling occupations. In A. J. Reiss, Jr. (Ed.), Occupations and social status. New York: The Free Press, 1961. (a)

Reiss, A. J., Jr. Social correlates of occupational prestige status. In A. J. Reiss, Jr. (Ed.), Occupations and social status. New York: The Free Press, 1961. (b)

Rey, L. D. Predicting women's educational aspirations: The influence of mother's employment and sex role attitudes. Sociological Focus, 1974, 7, 99-110.

Rezler, A. G. Characteristics of high school girls choosing traditional or pioneer vocations. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 659-665.

Rhile, M. E. The effect of support patterns on educational aspirations and performance. Unpublished manuscript, Oberlin College, 1968.

Richardson, M. S. Self-concepts and role-concepts in the career orientation of college women (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 5001B. (University Microfilms No. 73-09,040)

Richardson, M. S. The dimensions of career and work orientation in college women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 5, 161-172.

Richardson, M. S. Self-concepts and role concepts in the career orientation of college women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 122-126.

Ridley, J. Clare. Number of children expected in relation to non-familial activities of the wife. Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, 1959, 37, 276-296.

Riesman, D. The lonely crowd. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1950.

Roby, P. Structural and internalized barriers to women in higher education. In C. Safilios-Rothschild (Ed.), Toward a sociology of women. Lexington, Massachusetts: Xerox, 1972.

Roby, P. Sociology and women in working-class jobs. In M. Millman & R. M. Kanter (Eds.), Another voice: Feminist perspectives on social life and social science. Garden City, New York: Anchor, 1975.

Roe, A. The psychology of occupations. New York: Wiley, 1956.

Roe, A. Early determinants of vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 212-217.

Roe, A., & Siegelman, M. The origin of interests. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1964.

Rogers, C. R. Client-centered therapy: Its current practice, implications, and theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

Rose, A. The adequacy of women's expectations for adult roles. Social Forces, 1951, 30, 69-77.

Rose, H. A., & Elton, C. F. Sex and occupational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 456-461.

Rosen, B. C. Conflicting group membership: A study of parent-peer group cross-pressures. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 155-161.

Rosen, B. C. Family structure and achievement motivation. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 574-585.

Rosen, B. C., & D'Andrade, R. C. The psychosocial origins of achievement motivation. Sociometry, 1959, 22, 185-218.

Rosen, R. A. H. Occupational role innovators and sex role attitudes. Journal of Medical Education, 1974, 49, 554-561.

Rosenberg, B. G., & Sutton-Smith, B. Family interaction effects on masculinity-femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 117-120.

Rosenberg, B. G., & Sutton-Smith, B. Sex role identity and sibling composition. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1971, 118, 29-32.

Rosenberg, M. Occupations and values. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Rosenfeld, R. A. Women's intergenerational occupational mobility. American Sociological Review, 1978, 43, 36-46.

Rosenkrantz, P., Bee, H., Vogel, S., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. M. Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts of college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.

Rossi, A. S. Equality between the sexes: An immodest proposal. In R. J. Lifton (Ed.), The woman in America. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

Rossi, A. S. Barriers to the career choice of engineering, medicine, or science among American women. In J. A. Mattfield and C. G. Van Aken (Eds.), Women and the scientific professions. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1965. (a)

Rossi, A. S. Naming children in the middle class family. American Sociological Review, 1965, 30, 499-513. (b)

Rossi, A. S. Women in science: Why so few? Science, 1965, 148, 1196-1201. (c)

Rossi, A. S. Sex equality: The beginnings of ideology. *The Humanist*, 1969, *16*, 3-6.

Rossi, A. S. The roots of ambivalence in American women. In J. M. Bardwick (Ed.), *Readings in the psychology of women*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Rossmann, J. E. An investigation of maternal employment among college women: A twenty-five year follow-up (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1963). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1964, *25*, 2658-2659. (University Microfilms No. 64-7269)

Rothbart, M. K., & Maccoby, E. E. Parents' differential reactions to sons and daughters. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1966, *4*, 237-243.

Rozeboom, W. W. *Foundations of the theory of prediction*. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1966.

Rubin, L. B. *Worlds of pain: Life in the working class family*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Safilios-Rothschild, C. The influence of the wife's degree of work commitment upon some aspects of family organization and dynamics. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1970, *32*, 681-691. (a)

Safilios-Rothschild, C. The study of family power structure: A review, 1960-1969. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1970, *32*, 539-552. (b)

Safilios-Rothschild, C. Dual linkages between the occupational and family systems: A macrosociological analysis. In A. S. Skolnick & J. H. Skolnick (Eds.), *Family in transition* (2nd ed.). Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.

Sampson, E. E. Birth order, need achievement, and conformity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1962, *64*, 155-159.

Sandis, E. E. The transmission of mother's educational ambitions as related to specific socialization techniques. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1970, *32*, 204-211.

Sanford, N. (Ed.). Personality development during the college years. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1956, *12*.

Sarbin, T. R. A preface to a psychological analysis of self. *Psychological Review*, 1952, *59*, 11-22.

Sarbin, T. R. Role theory. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology (1st. ed., Vol. 1). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Sarbin, T. R., & Allen, V. L. Role theory. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (2nd ed., Vol. 1). Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Schab, F. Southern college women. Journal of The American Association of University Women, 1967, 60, 142-144.

Schab, F. Women preparing to teach. Journal of The American Association of University Women, 1968, 61, 60-61.

Schachter, S. Birth order, eminence, and higher education. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 757-768.

Schain, W. S. Psychodynamic factors affecting women's occupational choice: Parent-child relations, expressed needs and level of ego development (Doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 1991A-1992A. (University Microfilms No. 74-23,499)

Schissel, R. F. Development of a career-orientation scale for women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 257-262.

Schmidt, M. R. Personality change in college women. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1970, 11, 414-418.

Schoenfeld, Eugen. Status and career decision: An analysis of the time dimension. Sociological Quarterly, 1972, 13, 496-507.

Scott, Jeanne. YWCA vocational readiness package. Los Angeles: YWCA, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 098 448)

Sears, P. S. Child-rearing factors related to sex-typed roles. American Psychologist, 1953, 8, 431. (Abstract)

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Sedney, M. A., & Turner, B. F. A test of causal sequences in two models for development of career orientation in women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1975, 6, 281-291.

Seligman, D. The new masses. Fortune, May 1959, pp. 106-107.

Sell, J. A. The relationship between black mothers' attitudes towards sex roles and their educational expectations for their daughters. Paper presented at the meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, College Park, Maryland, August 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 078 996)

Seward, G. H. Cultural conflict and the female role. Journal of Social Psychology, 1945, 22, 177-194.

Sewell, W. H., Haller, A. O., & Ohlendorf, G. W. The educational and early occupational status attainment process: Replication and revision. American Sociological Review, 1970, 35, 1014-1027.

Sewell, W. H., Haller, A. O., & Portes, A. The educational and early occupational attainment process. American Sociological Review, 1969, 34, 82-92.

Sewell, W. H., Haller, A. O., & Strauss, M. A. Social status and educational aspirations. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 67-73.

Sexton, P. C. Wife of the "happy worker." In A. B. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.), Blue-collar world. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Sharp, L. M. Education and employment: The early careers of college graduates. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1970.

Shaw, M. C., & Dutton, B. The use of the parent attitude research inventory with the parents of bright academic underachievers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1962, 53, 203-208.

Shaw, M. E., & Wright, J. M. Scales for the measurement of attitudes. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.

Shea, J. R. Years for decision: A longitudinal study of the educational and labor market experience of young women (Vol. 1). Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Center for Human Resource Research, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 049 376)

Shepard, W. O., & Hess, D. T. Attitudes in four age groups towards sex role division in adult occupations and activities. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1975, 6, 27-39.

Shephard, R. N., Romney, A. K., & Nerlove, S. B. (Eds.). Multidimensional scaling: Theory and applications in the behavioral sciences (Vol. 1). New York: Seminar Press, 1972.

Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. Social psychology. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Shibutani, T. Society and personality. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1961.

Shinar, E. H. Sexual stereotypes of occupations. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1975, 7, 99-111.

Siegel, A. E., & Curtis, E. Familial correlates of orientation toward future employment among college women. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1963, 54, 33-37.

Siegel, P. M. Prestige scores for all occupations. In The American occupational prestige structure. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1970.

Silber, E., & Tippett, J. S. Self-esteem: Clinical assessment and measurement validation. Psychological Reports, 1965, 16, 1017.

Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. Working-class youth: Alienation without an image. In L. K. Howe (Ed.), The white majority: Between poverty and affluence. New York: Vintage, 1970.

Simpson, R. L. Parental influence, anticipatory socialization, and social mobility. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 517-522.

Simpson, R. L., & Simpson, I. H. Occupational choice among career-oriented college women. Marriage and Family Living, 1961, 23, 377-383.

Singer, S., & Stefflre, B. The relationship of job values and desires to vocational aspirations of adolescents. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1954, 38, 419-422. (a)

Singer, S., & Stefflre, B. Sex differences in job values and desires. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1954, 36, 483-484. (b)

Skolnick, A. The myth of the vulnerable child. Psychology Today, February 1978, pp. 56-58; 60; 65.

Smith, T. E. Social class and adolescents' attitudes toward adopting or rejecting their fathers' frame of reference (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1964). Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 25 2659. (University Microfilms No. 64-10,858)

Sobol, M. G., Commitment to work. In F. I. Nye & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), The employed mother in America. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1963.

Sorensen, J., & Winters, C. J. Parental influences on women's career development. In S. H. Osipow (Ed.), *Emerging woman: Career analysis and outlooks*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1975.

Spreitzer, E., & Riley, L. E. Factors associated with singlehood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1974, *36*, 533-541.

Standley, K., & Soule, B. Women in male-dominated professions: Contrasts in their personal and vocational histories. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1974, *4*, 245-258.

Stein, A. H. The effects of maternal employment and educational attainment on the sex-typed attributes of college females. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 1973, *1*, 111-114.

Stein, A. H., & Bailey, M. M. The socialization of achievement orientation in females. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1973, *80*, 345-366.

Steinem, G. "Why do women work, dear God, why do they work?" (without apologies to Freud). *Ms.*, March 1979, pp. 45, 46; 90; 92.

Steinmann, A. Women's attitudes towards careers. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, 1959, *8*, 15-18.

Steinmann, A. A study of the concept of the feminine role in 51 middle class American families. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 1963, *67*, 275-352.

Steinmann, A. Female-role perception as a factor in counseling. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, 1970, *34* 27-33.

Steinmann, A., Levi, J., & Fox, D. J. Self-concept of college women compared with their concept of ideal woman and man's ideal woman. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1964, *11*, 370-374.

Sterrett, J. E., & Bollman, S. R. Factors related to adolescents' expectation of marital roles. *The Family Coordinator*, 1970, *19*, 353-356.

Stewart, A. J., & Winter, D. G. Self-definition and social definition in women. *Journal of Personality*, 1974, *42*, 238-259.

Stoltz, L. Effects of maternal employment on children: Evidence from research. *Child Development*, 1960, *31*, 749-782.

Strodtbeck, F. Family interaction, values, and achievement. In D. C. McClelland, *Talent and society*. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1958.

Strong, D. J., & Feder, D. D. Measurement of the self-concept: A critique of the literature. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1961, *8*, 170-178.

Stuckert, R. P. Occupational mobility and family relationships. *Social Forces*, 1963, *41*, 301-307.

Sullivan, H. S. Beginnings of the self-system. In A. D. Ullman (Ed.), *Sociocultural foundations of personality*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

Super, D. E. A theory of vocational development. *American Psychologist*, 1953, *8*, 185-190.

Super, D. E. *The psychology of careers*. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Super, D. E. The structure of work values in relation to status, achievement interests, and adjustment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1962, *46*, 231-239.

Sweet, J. A. *Women in the labor force*. New York: Seminar Press, 1973.

Symonds, A. The liberated woman: Healthy and neurotic. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 1974, *34*, 177-183.

Symonds, P. M. *The ego and the self*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951.

Tangri, S. S. Determinants of occupational role innovation among college women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1972, *28*(2), 177-199.

Tavris, C. What does college do for a person? Frankly, very little: A conversation with Theodore Newcomb. *Psychology Today*, September 1974, pp. 72-80.

Tavris, C., & Offir, C. *The longest war: Sex differences in perspective*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.

Terkel, Studs. *Working*. New York: Avon Books, 1975.

Theodore, A. The professional woman: Trends and prospects. In A. Theodore (Ed.), *The professional woman*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman, 1971.

Thompson, S. K., & Bertler, P. M. A developmental study of gender constancy and parent preference. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 1973, *2*, 379-385.

Tibbetts, S. L. Sex-role stereotyping in the lower grades: Part of the solution. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1975, 6, 255-261.

Tiedeman, D. V. Career development of women: Some propositions. In O. D. David (Ed.), The education of women: Signs for the future. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1959.

Tiedeman, D. V. Decisions and vocational development: A paradigm and its implications. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1961, 40, 15-20.

Tiedt, S. M. Realistic counseling for high school girls. The School Counselor, 1972, 19, 354-356.

Tomeh, A. K. The impact of reference groups on the educational and occupational aspirations of women college students. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1968, 30, 102-110.

Trent, J. W., & Medsker, L. L. Beyond high school: A psychosociological study of 10,000 high school graduates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Trow, M. The democratization of higher education in America. European Journal of Sociology, 1962, 3, 231-262.

Trow, M. Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education. New York: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973. (Reprinted from a paper presented at the meeting of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, June 1973).

Turner, B. F. Socialization and career orientation among black and white college women. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Honolulu, September 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 074 412)

Turner, R. H. Some family determinants of ambition. Sociology and Social Research, 1962, 46, 397-411.

Turner, R. H. The social context of ambition. San Francisco: Chandler, 1964. (a)

Turner, R. H. Some aspects of women's ambitions. American Journal of Sociology, 1964, 70, 271-286. (b)

Turner, R. H. Upward mobility and class values. Social Problems, 1964, 11, 359-371. (c)

Turner, R. H., & Vanderlippe, R. H. Self-ideal congruence as an index of adjustment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 57, 202-206.

Tyler, L. E. The development of career interests in girls. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1964, 70, 203-212.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Alphabetical index of occupations and industries. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970. (a)

U. S. Bureau of the Census. United States summary: Detailed characteristics (Part 1). 1970 Census of Population. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970. (b)

U. S. Bureau of the Census. We the American women (No. 4). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

U. S. Department of Labor. How American buying habits change. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959.

U. S. Department of Labor. Educational attainment of workers. (Special Labor Force Report No. 53), Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

U. S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. College women seven years after graduation: Resurvey of women graduates, class of 1957 (Bulletin 292). Washington, D. C.: Women's Bureau, 1966.

U. S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. 1975 Handbook on women workers (Bulletin 297). Washington, D. C.: Women's Bureau, 1975.

Veres, H. C. Two-year college women: Dimensions of career choice and career commitment (Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 831A-832A. (University Microfilms No. 74-18,122)

Veres, H. C., & Moore, K. M. Career innovative and noninnovative women in the two-year college: Implications for counseling. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C., April 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 104 494)

Vetter, L., & Lewis, E. C. Some correlates of homemaking versus career preference among college home economics students. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 42, 593-598.

Vocational and Technical Education Curriculum Center. New dimensions in the career development of women (CP-2). Richmond, Virginia: State Department of Education, 1974.

Vogel, S. R., Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. Maternal employment and perceptions of sex-role stereotypes. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 384-391.

Wagman, M. Interests and values of career- and homemaking-oriented women. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, 794-801.

Wallace, W. L. The perspective of college women. In Student culture. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.

Wallin, P. Cultural contradictions and sex roles: A repeat study. American Sociological Review, 1950, 15, 288-293.

Wallston, B. The effects of maternal employment on children. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 1973, 14, 81-95.

Ward, W. D. Sex-role preference and parental imitation within groups of middle-class whites and lower-class blacks. Psychological Reports, 1972, 30, 651-654.

Watley, D. J. Career or marriage? A longitudinal study of able young women. National Merit Scholarship Corporation Research Reports, 1969, 5(7), 1-16.

Watson, W. B., & Barth, E. A. J. Questionable assumptions in the theory of social stratification. Pacific Sociological Review, 1964, 7, 10-16.

Webster, H. Personality development during the college years: Some quantitive results. Journal of Social Issues, 1956, 12, 29-43.

Wegner, E. E. Some factors in obtaining postgraduate education. Sociology of Education, 1969, 42, 154-169.

Weil, M. W. An analysis of the factors influencing married women's actual or planned work participation. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 91-96.

Wellman, B. Social identities and cosmopolitanism among urban adolescents: Variation by race, social status, and school integration experience. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1969.

Werts, C. E. Social class and career choice of college freshmen. *National Merit Scholarship Corporation Research Reports*, *1*(8), 1965.

Werts, C. E. Career choice patterns: Ability and social class. *National Merit Scholarship Corporation Research Reports*, *2*(3), 1966. (a)

Werts, C. E. Sex differences in college attendance. *National Merit Scholarship Corporation Research Reports*, 1966, *2*, 1-11. (b)

Werts, C. E. Career choice patterns. *Sociology of Education*, 1967, *40*, 348-358.

Werts, C. E., & Watley, D. J. Determinants of changes in career planning during college. *Sociology of Education*, 1968, *41*, 401-405.

Westoff, C. F., Potter, R. C., Jr., Sagi, P., & Mishler, E. G. *Family growth in metropolitan America*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Weston, P. J., & Mednick, M. T. Race, social class, and the motive to avoid success in women. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 1970, *1*, 284-291.

White, B. J. The relationship of self concept and parental identification to women's vocational interests. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1959, *6*, 202-206.

White, K. P. The relation of career involvement to persistence in the teaching professions among beginning female elementary teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*, 1966, *50*, 51-53.

White, K. P. Social background variables related to career commitment of women teachers. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1967, *45*, 648-652.

White, R. F. Female identity and career choice: The nursing case. In A. Theodore (Ed.), *The professional woman*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman, 1971.

Whitehurst, R. N. Employed mothers' influence on working-class family structure (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1963). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1964, *24*, 5600. (University Microfilms No. 64-5774)

Wiebe, B., & Williams, J. D. Self-disclosure to parents by high school seniors. *Psychological Reports*, 1972, *31*, 690.

Wilensky, H. L. Orderly careers and social participation: The impact of work history on social integration in the middle mass. *American Sociological Review*, 1961, *26*, 521-539.

Winch, R. F. *Identification and its familial determinants*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1962.

Winters, C. J., & Sorensen, J. Individual factors related to career orientation in women. In S. H. Osipow (Ed.), *Emerging woman: Career analysis and outlooks*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1975.

Witkin, M. H. The relationship between personality factors and attitudes towards women's roles and career aspirations of female college students (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1973). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1973, *34*, 1664A. (University Microfilms No. 73-19, 456.

Woelfel, J. *A paradigm for research on significant others*. Paper presented at the joint meeting of the American Sociological Association and the Society for the Study of Social Problems, San Francisco, August 1967.

Woelfel, J., & Haller, A. O. Significant others, the self-reflexive act and the attitude formation process. *American Sociological Review*, 1971, *36*, 74-87.

Wolfe, H. B. An analysis of the work values of women: Implications for counseling. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, 1969, *33*, 13-18. (a)

Wolfe, H. B. *Women in the world of work*. Albany, New York: University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Division of Research, 1969. (b)

Wolfson, K. T. P. Career development of college women (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1972). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1972, *33*, 169A. (University Microfilms No. 72-20,160)

Wolkon, K. A. Pioneer versus traditional: Two distinct vocational patterns of college alumnae. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1972, *2*, 275-282.

Wright, B. D., & Tuska, S. A. Career dreams of teachers. *Trans-action*, November 1968, pp. 43-47.

Wylie, R. C. *The self concept: A critical survey of pertinent research literature*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Yinger, J. M. *Toward a field theory of behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1965.

Young, T. R. *New sources of self*. New York: Pergamon Press, 1972.

Zissis, C. The relationship of selected variables to the career-marriage plans of University freshmen women (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1962, *23*, 128. (University Microfilms No. 62-2812)

Zytowski, D. G. Toward a theory of career development for women. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1969, *47*, 660-664.

Zytowski, D. G. The concept of work values. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, 1970, *18*, 176-186.